

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. XV

DECEMBER, 1944

No. 12

IN MEMORY OF

WILLIAM HERMAN THEODORE DAU

Theologian — Educator — Author — Church Leader

Born: February 8, 1864

Died: April 21, 1944

This issue of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, thanks to the generous co-operation of Concordia Publishing House, can present a picture of the sainted Dr. Dau together with a facsimile of an outline written by him in 1910 for a sermon preached in Messiah Lutheran Church, St. Louis, Mo. The neat, careful chirography, thoroughly characteristic of the man, will be noted. The original of the outline was in possession of the Rev. W. F. Lichtsinn, President of the Central District of our Synod, who kindly placed it at our disposal.

From 1905, when Professor Dau joined the Faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, till 1926, the year in which he relinquished this professorship to become president of Valparaiso University, his work on the parent journals of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY was continuous and of wide scope. He served especially as managing editor of the *Theological Quarterly*, and, from 1920 to 1926, of its successor, the *Theological Monthly*, and of the English section of the *Homiletical Magazine*.

One may safely predict that, as the years roll by, many searchers for soundly Scriptural and genuinely Lutheran discussions of theological subjects will turn with gratitude and admiration to the classical sermons, books, and articles of the departed leader. What he produced can fittingly be called "apples of gold in pictures of silver" (Prov. 25:11).

May the Church be granted many more men like him!

A.

Gal. 5, 16-24. Mesiah, St. L. Aug. 28, 1910.

The Work of Divine Grace in a Christian:

1. it causes the Christian to battle against sin;
2. it cultivates the virtues of the new life.

I. Strange state of affairs: being righteous and yet a sinner.

Solution: Distinguish betw. justification & sanctification.
The good Samaritan.

Two forces at war in the regenerate: formerly peace, the quiet of spiritual death; now new life asserts itself.

The struggle does not always result in a victory for the Spirit: the saints fall seven times a day. Each his peculiar struggle! Nor does the flesh have its way entirely, in the regenerate old habits are being revisited.

Strength comes to the Christian in the battle; he grows stronger by fighting. He that is within you is mightier - -

See the swimmer! That is Christianity.

A spectacle for the angels! -

This battle is no reflection on our Christianity!

The battle of the saints! Paul - Luther

Rest all the sweeter afterward!

T. The heart by nature a field overgrown with weeds - every malignant growth imaginable is there.

Out of this heart the Spirit grows beautiful products of divine grace.

The arid wastes of So. California and Arizona burst into flower under irrigation.

Gold brought out of the earth mixed with dross
priceless diamonds imbedded in ugly lumps of coal
lustrous pearls hidden in the slime and dirt of the mussel
beautiful cochineal from an ugly insect
gorgeous silk from a worm

Such is the power of God - is His grace less mighty?

Drunkards raised from the depths of degradation - Impurities
Haters liberal - Proud humble

Forgiving mind in place of revengeful spirit
Benevolent gentle - Grumbler contented.

All this not in a day - harvest must have time to grow
Noah - David - Zachary - Medembus - Peter: folly in the
saints - but grace fashioned them nevertheless.

Look to grace and be content even with a small victory!

Liberal Theology and the Reformed Churches

The characteristic elements of the thought world during the past 75 years may be reduced to two outstanding and significant movements: science and democracy. Man placed an almost absolute faith in the omniscience of science. Science became a cult. The empirical method of science was considered the only means by which truth could be discovered and judged. The "scientific" method attempted to displace revelation; it branded the Scriptural theology as metaphysics and relegated it to the museums; it tended to eliminate the idea of God from human thought and to make man self-sufficient; its astronomical and biological theories questioned the geocentric and anthropocentric view of our universe and challenged Scripture, which assigns to man the central position in God's creation; it reduced the universe to a set of mechanical laws and thereby ruled divine creation and providence out of existence. Hand in hand with the cult of science went the cult of democracy. Science, so called, held that man's biological and psychological progress is a basic law of nature; that man is destined to go upward and onward, for as man progresses biologically and intellectually, he will conquer the forces of his environment which have impeded his upward reach, and ultimately he will attain a relatively high standard of social, economic, and religious ethics. The sociologist, however, was disturbed to find that the human race was progressing too slowly toward the projected social and ethical ideal, and blamed the capitalistic system for impeding mankind's progress. He believed that the hope of society's social and ethical redemption rested upon a complete reconstruction of the social order. The student of sociology envisioned a society which, liberated from the fangs of capitalism and power politics, would build the economic and political power on industrial democracy. Democracy became the fetish. God was "democratized," the ethical standard was made conformable to a democratic society,¹⁾ democracy was apotheosized. Instead of recognizing the anti-Scriptural and even antireligious character of these two ideologies, many theologians, especially within the Congregational churches, adopted the scientific method in theology and as a result accepted the principles of the higher critics, evolutionists, and religious empiricists.²⁾ But this left them

1) Marxian Communism held that the Decalog was the ancient plutocracy's instrument to exert by threats its undisputed lordship over the proletariat. The Sixth Commandment was "invented" by the sheik to protect his harem, and the Seventh to protect the property obtained by exploiting the poor people. — Knudson, A. C., *Present Tendencies in Religious Thought*, 1924, chapter I, offers an analysis of the dominant world views during the years 1875–1920.

2) This matter was discussed in the October issue of this magazine.

only a system of denials and negations, and these liberal theologians felt the need of a positive message. This they found in the new social "sciences." After having accepted the scientific method as the *principium cognoscendi*, the majority of liberal theologians made "democracy" the burden of their message.³⁾

But how was it possible that Modernism with its denial of the fundamental truths of Christianity and its social gospel message gained such a foothold in the denominations whose historic background was genuinely Christian? The immediate answer is, of course, that all Reformed bodies have inherited the Zwinglian enthusiasm. This, however, is not the complete answer. Each of the Reformed denominations has a distinctive characteristic which made it particularly vulnerable to the onslaughts of Liberalism and made it susceptible to the social gospel message.⁴⁾

The Protestant Episcopal Church

One characteristic of Anglicanism and Episcopalianism is latitudinarianism, as is evident from the fact that some of its members are High Church (Romanizing tendencies), others Broad Church (toleration of divergent theological views), and still others Low Church (conservatism in theology and ritual). The Anglican Church "is at once the most authoritative and the least disciplined of all Protestant Churches."⁵⁾ This is brought to light very forcibly in the Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine Appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922, entitled *Doctrine in the Church of England*. This report not only lists the contradictory views held by Anglicans on such important doctrines

3) Hopkins, C. H., *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism*, traces the social and economic factors which led to acceptance of the social gospel. Heinz-Horst Schrey, a keen German scholar, analyzes the American theological scene and groups the social gospel exponents as follows: 1. The radical school, which is ready to unite with any group to destroy capitalism. This is the school of W. Rauschenbusch. (In his book *Christianizing the Social Order*, p. 330, Rauschenbusch says: "In his contest against the priests of Baal, at Mount Carmel, Elijah proposed the test: 'The God that answereth by fire, let him be God.' Chas. H. Spurgeon christianized the text: 'The God that answereth by orphanages, let him be God.' In our present conflict between God and Mammon we shall finally have to socialize it: 'The God that answereth by low food prices, let him be God.'") 2. The idealistic school, which considers the church the educational institution to lead men to a social utopia, represented by Shailer Mathews. 3. The realistic school, which believes that social justice tempered by love is attainable only if God intervenes. The dialectical theologians, chiefly Niebuhr, represent this view. *Theologische Rundschau*, 1938, Feb., pp. 23-52.

4) "Changes in Theology" (four articles), *American Journal of Theology*, X, 1906. — E. C. Vanderlaan, *Fundamentalism and Modernism*, 1925. This is a well-selected collection of articles written by both Fundamentalists and Modernists.

5) *Anglican Theological Review*, April, 1940, p. 143.

as the Virgin Birth, the Scriptures, man, but grants them equal rights in the Church of England.⁶⁾ The Protestant Episcopal Church occupies the same latitudinarian position as their English coreligionists, for its Department of Religious Education recommends this volume as setting forth the Episcopalian theological position. The late Theo. Will says that in the modern Babel the religious seeker will find in the Episcopal Church among other things faith (toleration of schools of thought which are at variance with each other) and the right to worship God according to the dictates of the individual's conscience.⁷⁾ Prof. W. Norman Pittenger of the (Episcopalian) General Theological Seminary in New York in an article "What Is Disturbing the Episcopalians?" is not disturbed over the fact that "from Anglo-Catholicism to Evangelicalism, the Episcopal Church seems to cover almost all types of Christian expression." But he is disturbed over the questions whether or not the Episcopal Church can adjust itself to the new "catholicism" (unionism) of the current ecumenical movement, and will permit those deviations and divergences from the central tradition (the apostolic succession) which will be fruitful and contributory to its own richness and development.⁸⁾ It is a pity indeed that the church body of such outstanding Bible-believing scholars as Westcott, Hort, Lightfoot, Edersheim, Church, is committed to the principle which not only allows but encourages divergent theological views. Doctrinal discipline is impossible in the Anglican or Episcopalian bodies. Is it any wonder, then, that crass Liberalism is not only tolerated but given equal right with orthodox Christianity? From the Kantian idealist Coleridge, a contemporary of Schleiermacher and exponent of his theology, down to Dean Inge and Archbishop Temple Liberalism has demanded "house right" in the Anglican Church under the nondescript term of Broad Churchism. From Charles Briggs, who fifty years ago after his suspension from the Presbyterian Church because of his espousal of higher criticism joined the Episcopal Church, down to the present leaders in the Episcopal Church Liberal Theology is rampant, and nothing can be done to silence the liberals. And with the introduction of Liberalism came the preaching of the social gospel. One can readily understand that in England, where Church and State are so closely allied, the social program of Modernism would find

6) See our review of this volume in C. T. M., X, p. 556 f.

7) *The Episcopal Church*, pp. 38—44, 139.

8) *Christian Century*, May 10, 1944, p. 586ff. The recently consecrated bishop of the Washington Diocese, Angus Dun, himself a liberal social gospelite, discusses the latitudinarianism of his Church in an article with the significant title: "The Ambiguous Episcopal Church." *Christendom*, winter issue, 1941, pp. 3—13.

ready acceptance if such a program would agree with the policies of the State. At present the social gospel message is being urged in England by Wm. Temple, Primate of the English Church.⁹⁾ One would, however, suspect that owing to their traditions and environment the majority of Episcopalians, while embracing Liberalism, would not be greatly interested in the program of the social gospel. Nevertheless the Episcopal Church together with Congregationalists assumed the leadership in initiating a social-service program, though, of course, not without protest.¹⁰⁾

The Baptist Churches

"It is a distinct principle with Baptists that they acknowledge no human founder, recognize no human authority, and subscribe to no human creed. For all these things, Baptists of every name and order go back to the New Testament."¹¹⁾ In Baptist theology "the right of private judgment is the crown jewel of humanity," and "absolute liberty of conscience under Christ has always been a distinguishing tenet of Baptists. Since every member of the Church is a member of Christ, he has the right to interpret Christ's will for himself."¹²⁾ This principle has become a two-edged sword.

9) The archbishop's two books, *The Hope of a New World* (1937) and *Christianity and the Social Order* (1942), and his six-point program for the full development of individual personality (published as a full-page advertisement by Pan-American Clippers in *Time*, Nov. 9, 1942) clearly indicate his leanings toward the social gospel and explain why he was severely criticized for "meddling in the affairs of Caesar," as reported in *Christian Century*, Nov. 10, 1942, p. 1431.

10) Hopkins, *op. cit.*, p. 287ff. The plot of the *Inside of the Cup*, a tendential novel by Winston Churchill, turns on the efforts of an Episcopal rector to put the social gospel into practice. — F. C. Grant, a prominent Episcopalian and professor at the liberal (Presbyterian) Union Seminary, espouses the social gospel. "The Kingdom of God is not in heaven, but God's reign in this present world. The central Christian conviction is essentially social, and the work of the Church must be secular. Christians must enter politics and business." *The Living Church*, March 12, 1941. Grant believes that Jesus viewed the Kingdom of God as a theocracy in which men's lives will be changed to conform to the principles of the Golden Rule. *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, p. 130f. Bishop Geo. St. Tucker, as president of the Federal Council of Churches, must support the social gospel program of this federation.

11) *Census of Religious Bodies*, 1936, II, p. 83.

12) A. H. Strong, *Christ in Creation and Ethical Nomism*, pp. 252, 257. The belief that every individual soul must be granted the right and the competence to judge all religious questions and must be unfettered by credal formulations is a result in a large measure of the early Baptists' reaction against the hierarchical and authoritarian regime of the Church of England. Wm. Rogers' principles of independency were not only social and political, but religious as well, and these principles gave point and emphasis to Baptist theology in America. "Ecclesiastical democracy" is

The conservative Baptists are in danger of ecclesiastical atomism, the liberal Baptists of complete doctrinal indifference. In their loyalty to the Baptist principle the former group will interpret Scriptures literalistically, and the latter will view Scriptures only as a record of man's religious experiences.¹³⁾ At any rate, the Baptist principle has permitted Liberalism to enter Baptist churches without in any way denying the central principle of Baptist theology. This is true especially among the Baptist churches of the Northern Baptist Convention, where Modernism was spearheaded by the theological departments of Colgate and Chicago Universities. At Colgate the new theology was advocated primarily by Wm. N. Clarke and Walter Rauschenbusch, the former systematizing the new theology and the latter popularizing the social gospel.¹⁴⁾

the watchword of Baptists. G. B. Foster, the archliberal professor of the University of Chicago, writes: "Strictly speaking, there can be no heresy, technically so called, in the Baptist denomination, for the reason that there is no creed subscription; no creed subscription for the reason that there is no formal creed; no formal creed for the reason that Baptist churches, unlike the hybrid of ecclesiastical Protestantism, hold to the right of private judgment, of freedom of conscience, and of freedom of thought and speech. It is not that creed is a matter of indifference to religion from the Baptist point of view; it is that the right of the individual to form his own creed is inalienable and that this right which was exercised by Baptists in the past, resulting in a certain set of beliefs, carries therewith the right today of either accepting, or modifying, or replacing those past beliefs." *Finality of the Christian Religion*, XIII. But even such a conservative Baptist theologian as the late Dr. Geo. Truett in his presidential address before the Baptist convention stated that every human soul must be granted the competence under God to interpret the New Testament and that no thing extraneous, as sacrament or priest, dare come between the individual and his God. *Watchman-Examiner*, Aug. 10, 1939. The following books are suggested for those who wish to obtain a clear understanding of the Baptists' central principle: J. Ernst, *Roger Williams, the New England Firebrand*; A. Newman, *History of Baptist Churches*; W. J. McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith*; H. H. Stratton, *Baptists, Their Message and Mission*; O. Wallace, *What Baptists Believe*; also an article by A. H. Newman, "Recent Changes in Theology of Baptists," *American Journal of Religion*, X, pp. 587-609.

13) The Baptists are currently disturbed over the demand of some conservatives that the missionaries under the jurisdiction of the Board of the American Baptist Mission Society sign a credal statement professing their faith in the fundamental doctrines of Scriptures, which some of these foreign missionaries have denied. This was a major issue at the recent convention of the Baptists. But the Board's position was upheld, namely, "that authoritative creeds are the beginning of the reign of ecclesiasticism and dogmatism, sound the death knell of individual religious freedom, and lead to intellectual dishonesty because individual religious concepts are never static for those who search the Scriptures with open mind." *Watchman-Examiner*, Sept. 10, 1943; March 23, April 6, Aug. 10, 1944. *Christian Century*, March 29, 1944.

14) Clarke's important writings, *Outline of Christian Theology*, 1898, and *The Christian Doctrine of God*, 1909, used by many liberal theological seminaries as textbooks. — Rauschenbusch's theology was discussed in the July issue of C. T. M.

Clarke's theology is a synthesis of the various forms of the new German theology. As a disciple of Schleiermacher he believed that all religious knowledge is gained by experience. As a Ritschlian he held that Jesus spurned metaphysical speculations about God and presented only such thoughts of God as agreed with the thought patterns of His age. As an adherent of the Troeltschian History of Religions School he espoused the theory of evolution in religion. He found the sources of Christian doctrine not only in the Old Testament, but also among the primitive and pagan thoughts of men; the Old Testament contained both lofty ethical conceptions and primitive notions. Jesus discarded the latter and imparted a better knowledge of God than any other by accommodating His revelation of God to the thought patterns of His age; the early Church expressed its needs of God in the concept of the Trinity, a term which, however, does not satisfy the needs of modern man; in fact, the concept of God is not as yet final.¹⁵⁾ Clarke attempted to bridge the chasm which lies between the Calvinistic sovereignty of God and Liberalism's theory of divine immanence. In this attempt he arrives at a definition of God which makes of God hardly any more than the forces active in the world and which asks man to "trust in a beneficent steadiness of operation in the world."¹⁶⁾ Clarke is very largely responsible for robbing many young Baptist theologians of their traditional faith in the all-sufficiency and inerrancy of the Bible. He supplanted revelation by human philosophy.

15) *The Christian Doctrine of God*, pp. 11, 46, 52, 240, 323.

16) *Op. cit.*, p. 334. — "A truth so central as the immanence of the transcendent God cannot fail to dictate throughout the entire field of doctrine. By its own nature it presses in to the definitions that belong alike to theology and to the common thoughts of men. Where it is not influential today, it is certain to be tomorrow. In view of it, creation was not a work of days, undertaken, performed, and finished, followed by cessation and rest. Creation is the productive outflow of the divine energy, normal to God, limitless in time, conditioned only by his nature and will. Providence is not a series of interpositions in which God's world is touched and retouched by his special power in order to better the work of the general method. Providence is the perpetual governance of the indwelling Lord and Friend, no part of whose world is ever without his presence and care. Revelation is not a special work in a special field, mediated by messengers, attended by attesting miracles, limited to a certain time, completed and not to be renewed. Revelation equally includes the continuous, infinitely varied and endless manifestation of the transcendent God through his indwelling, and all more special expressions of himself that he may make. Salvation is not an exceptional gift of grace from afar, but the characteristic working-out of the eternal divinity of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit is the fulfillment of the ideal of existence." *Op. cit.*, p. 342.

The University of Chicago, founded by Baptists, endowed by a Baptist, controlled by Baptists, became the hotbed of Liberal Theology in the Middle West, and in far greater measure than Colgate became responsible for Modernism in the Northern Baptist Convention. W. R. Rainey Harper (first president and Semitic scholar), J. M. Powis Smith (Old Testament), G. B. Smith and G. B. Foster (systematic theology, *i. e.*, philosophy), S. J. Case (New Testament), and E. A. Haydon (history) were the men who were largely responsible for tearing down the old faith, while Shailer Mathews is regarded as the man who attempted to build the social gospel upon the ruins caused by higher criticism, evolutionism, and empiricism. "Social Christianity" became Mathews' watchword.¹⁷⁾ His theology was Ritschlian, both in its approach and in its message. Mathews employed the empirical method and by this method found that the term God is merely man's symbol to define the "personality-evolving force in the universe." "God" is the activity which creates our environment and our personality, the cosmic processes which reinforce and create personal relations.¹⁸⁾ But Mathews was not interested so much in a metaphysical nor even in a practical definition of God, but solely in obtaining close co-operation between churches, classes, nations, and races, so that society can really become God's workshop. He found "the heart of the social gospel in the teachings of Jesus as to fatherliness of God, the brotherhood of man, and the supreme value of personality."¹⁹⁾ When men co-operate with each other and make it possible for every individual to develop his inherent potentiality to the highest degree, then they are co-operating with God (*i. e.*, the personality-evolving force) and are establishing the Kingdom of God. This theology appeals to man's reason, because it is on the level of reason. But it did irreparable damage to the faith of thousands in the Baptist churches. Thus the history of anti-

17) Among his many writings we list *Faith of Modernism*, 1924, and *Atonement and the Social Process*, 1930.

18) "Like a vast parabola, the personality-evolving activities of the cosmos touch our little circle of experience. We know not whence they come or whither they go, but we cannot evade them. We set up relations with them similar to those which we set up with persons. And thus we derive new strength and courage and moral motive for facing the tasks of life and building up a world order in which personal relations will be more perfectly adjusted and human life happier." *Growth of the Idea of God*, p. 230, quoted in Wieman and Meland, *American Philosophies of Religion*, p. 289. It appears as though Mathews was a Humanist, but he may best be classified as an empirical theist. He takes sharp issue with Humanism in his contribution to Wm. King, ed., *Humanism, Another Battle Line*, ch. V, "Can We Have Religion Without God?" Cf. Aubrey's evaluation of Mathews in *Journal of Religion*, 1942, pp. 341-345.

19) *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*, Mathews and Smith, s. v. Social Gospel.

credalism in the Baptist churches is a shocking example of the ultimate fate of churches which reject creeds and refuse to practice doctrinal discipline. Many Fundamentalist Baptists are seriously concerned about the inevitable consequence of their basic principle.²⁰⁾

The Methodist Church

Methodist theology is the very antithesis of Calvinism.²¹⁾ It is true, of course, that the formal principle of Methodism resembles that of Calvinism, since both stem from Zwinglian rationalism and enthusiasm. In the Preface to his *Collected Works*, Wesley expresses the hope that he has written what "is agreeable to Scripture, reason, and Christian antiquity." In addition to the Scriptures, reason, "going hand in hand with religion," and Christian experience, especially that of the ante-Nicene Fathers, are therefore Wesley's source of religious knowledge.²²⁾ And in this respect Calvinistic and Methodistic theology are agreed. But since Calvinistic theology is theocentric, while Methodistic theology is anthropocentric, the material principles of the two systems are the very opposites. The sovereignty of God, as the material principle of Calvinism, implies as its correlative the total inability of man to do anything good in the realms of "common" and of "special" grace. The true Calvinist therefore repudiates the very principles on which the entire social gospel is based, viz., man's capacity for self-salvation. The consistent Calvinist cannot conceive of an improvement in society unless the sovereign God interferes with his irresistible "grace." This is undoubtedly the reason why not a few fundamental and consistent Calvinists are ardent advocates of premillennialism. Before the Calvinist can subscribe to the underlying principles of the social gospel he must discard the material principle of Calvinism. His formal principle, rationalism, will permit him to do this very thing. In Methodist theology, however, the material principle actually prepares the ground for the message of the social gospel. In assuming the leadership in the rise and development of the social gospel, Methodists have remained loyal to the theological principles of the founder of Methodism. A study of Wesley's theology will explain how it was possible that the movement which did so much for evangelical Christianity, which gave

20) Contributors to the Baptist weekly, the *Watchman-Examiner*, again and again call attention to the anomalous situation that ministerial candidates profess to accept the New Testament and deny the plain teaching of it. Issues of May 23, 1940, p. 570; Oct. 21, 1943, p. 1006.

21) See Five Points of Calvinism, *Popular Symbolics*, p. 228 ff.

22) Umphrey Lee, *John Wesley and Modern Religion*, p. 132 ff.

to the Church many of its cherished hymns, actually eventuated in the social gospel.²³⁾

Wesley's theology may be summarized as teaching a fourfold salvation: universal, free, full, and sure salvation.²⁴⁾ Wesley's "universal salvation" implies not only that Christ procured salvation for all men, but that this salvation is actually offered to all, even to those who never hear the Gospel. In support of this "universality of opportunity" Wesley, Fletcher, and other early Methodists adopted a modification of the Origenian view of God's threefold kingdom. They held that the Father's dispensation embraces all men, since all are able to know God from their conscience; the Kingdom of Christ is restricted to those who actually hear the Gospel; and the dispensation of the Holy Spirit is still further restricted to those who have an experimental knowledge of Christ. Since according to Rom. 5:18 condemnation came upon all, so also justification must actually come upon all. Forgetting that God deals with man through the means of grace, Wesley held that man's responsibility will be measured by his ability and opportunity; that everyone will be saved unless he deliberately rejects grace and transgresses willfully a *known* law; that the heathen actually accept the "Gospel" when they live up to the measure of light bestowed upon them; that in case "Christian" perfection is unattainable, a relative perfection is sufficient.²⁵⁾ This explains the notorious

23) U. Lee, *op. cit.*, is in our opinion the best study on Wesley's theological development. The following additional writings are suggested: Arn. Lunn, *John Wesley*; F. J. McConnell, *John Wesley*; Maximin Piette, *John Wesley in Evolution of Protestantism* (A Roman Catholic's evaluation); J. Mudge, *Heart Religion as Described by Wesley*; N. R. Flew, *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology*, ch. XI; the centennial issue of the *Christian Advocate*, May 19, 1938; J. L. Neve, *Churches and Sects*, pp. 378-423; P. Kern, *Methodism Has a Message*.

24) H. P. Sloan puts it thus: Methodism has four characteristics: 1. Justification by faith alone. (Sloan explains: Unity with God is the genius of religion; faith unites us with Christ and becomes the spring of oneness with the Infinite); 2. True freedom of human personality; 3. The doctrine of the pure heart; 4. The witness of the Spirit. *Christian Advocate*, May 19, 1938, p. 473. Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, I, p. 897 ff., contrasts Methodism with Catholicism, Lutheranism, and Calvinism on three points: universal, full, and sure salvation.

25) From Wesley's Journal: "I read today part of the meditations of Marcus Antonius. . . . I doubt but what this is one of those many who shall come from the East and the West and sit down with Abraham." Quoted in Robert Southey, *Life of John Wesley*, II, p. 89, footnote. This is, of course, Pelagianism. So is this: "A mystic who denies justification by faith may be saved. But if so, what becomes of *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae* (justification by faith)? If so, is it not high time for us to reject bombast and words half a yard long and to return to the plain words: 'He that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is accepted of Him?'" *Journal*, quoted by Lee, *op. cit.*, 161. This is still the view of Methodism, for the well-known Methodist theologian F. H. Rall, winner of the Bross Prize (\$15,000) for his *Christianity*, answers the

indifference to doctrine prevalent among Methodists. Wesley spoke most disparagingly of men who seriously debated theological questions.²⁶⁾ Professor Sheldon of Boston University said that "the genius of Methodism makes dogma subordinate to life,"²⁷⁾ and Bishop Rowe says: "To put it epigrammatically, the distinguishing doctrine of Methodism is that it has no distinguishing doctrine."²⁸⁾ Fortunately, Wesley's burning love for the Savior did not permit him to make the inevitable deductions of his theory concerning universal salvation. But when it is properly analyzed, it is apparent that there is a difference only in degree between Methodist theology and Modernism. The same verdict must be passed on Wesley's second basic principle, "free salvation." Wesley did not understand this term to mean that salvation is offered freely, but rather that man by his free will is able to decide for or against the Gospel. The Arminians' and Wesley's emphasis on free will was a reaction against the Calvinistic doctrine of the irresistibility of grace. However, it must be noted that Wesley's Arminianism is essentially Pelagian, for he denies the *total* depravity of man, views original sin as not actually sin, and ascribes spiritual powers to man which are quickened by God's "preventing grace," so that man can proceed from lower to higher levels of the "Christian" life.²⁹⁾ A modernistic Methodist will have little difficulty in recon-

question: Is Christ the Savior or a savior? by stating that there always has been some knowledge of God available to men, that John 15:22-24 is only "a paradoxical way of putting the truth that men are judged by the light they have and the use they make of it," and that according to Matt. 25 many who had never known Christ will enter the Kingdom. *Christian Advocate*, December 17, 1942, p. 26.

26) "I will not quarrel with you about any mere opinion. Only see that your heart be right toward God; that you know and love the Lord Jesus Christ; that you love your neighbor and walk as your Master walked; and I desire no more. I am sick of opinions; I am weary to hear them. My soul loathes this frothy food. Give me solid and substantial religion; give me an humble and gentle lover of God and man; a man full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy; a man laying himself out in the work of faith, the patience of hope, the labor of love. Let my soul be with these Christians, whosoever they are and whatsoever opinion they are of." Wesley, as quoted by G. T. Rowe, *The Meaning of Methodism*, p. 24.

27) "Changes in Theology Among Methodists," *American Journal of Religion*, X, p. 52.

28) *Op. cit.*, p. 123. This indifference to doctrine accounts for the fact that a relatively large number of Methodist ministers have received little theological training and that the Methodist Church in spite of its numerical strength and two centuries of history has produced few theological scholars. It required only sixteen words to dispose of all doctrinal matters in the merger of 1938 uniting three large Methodist branches. *Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Church*, 1944, p. 3. However, it should be noted that the historic Articles of Religion are included in the new manual.

29) *Twenty-Five Articles of Religion*, VII and VIII, Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

ciling Wesley's "free" salvation and his own modernistic concept of man.

"Full salvation" really constitutes the heart of Wesley's theology. Repentance and faith were for Wesley actually only preliminary, while sanctification, entire sanctification, or perfect love, constitute the essence of Christianity.³⁰⁾ Wesley's overemphasis of sanctification is no doubt due on the one hand to his reaction against the dead orthodoxy of the Anglican Church, with its many concomitant spiritual and social evils, and on the other to the early training in his parental home at Epworth and the reading of such books as Thomas à Kempis's *Imitatio Christi*, Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living and Holy Dying*, and William Law's *Christian Perfection*. Wesley's interest centered not so much in the *justified* as in the *sanctified* Christian. "It was not a new doctrine, but new life the first Methodists sought for themselves and others. To realize in the hearts of men the true ideal of Christianity, to maintain its personal experience and to extend it—this was their design."³¹⁾ It is significant that the confessional standard for Methodist preachers is the collection of Wesley's *preached* sermons. Methodism is not concerned with laying a definite theological foundation for Christian life, but rather with fixing a system of rules. The Methodist "discipline" has become a technical term.³²⁾ The class system was inaugurated to watch the individual and aid him in reaching a relative perfection, i. e., commensurate with man's ability and opportunity. Wesley himself carefully kept a diary, in order to check his "moment by moment growth" in perfection. The modernistic Methodist is therefore following the basic lines of Wesley when he substitutes a gospel of *social* perfection for Wesley's message of *individual* perfection. When the modern Methodist minister devotes his pastoral energies toward improving the community and the nation politically and socially, he is a very consistent Methodist indeed. The realm of the original class leader, who was responsible for the spiritual growth of a group of ten mem-

30) The Aldersgate experience was not Wesley's conversion to Christianity, but an emotional experience in which he felt certain that after years of wrestling he had now conquered inbred sin and was serving the Lord fully and perfectly, i. e., according to the measure of grace bestowed upon him "moment by moment." The most recent among the many studies of Wesley's idea of perfection is W. E. Sangster, *The Path to Perfection*. See especially pp. 77 ff. Wesley said: "Repentance is the porch, faith the door, perfection the house of Christianity."

31) Bishop C. C. Seceman, *The Methodist Primer*, p. 29.

32) In the 1944 manual the term discipline is defined: "The official and published statement of the Constitution and law of the Methodist Church, its rules of organization and procedure, the description of administrative agencies and their functions, and the Ritual." *Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Church*, 1944, p. 597. The discipline was emphasized in the film "One Foot in Heaven."

bers, has been changed to the position of a community leader, who feels that he is responsible for the moral and social growth of all members in his community.³³⁾ — "Sure" salvation, the fourth point in Wesley's theology is an integral part of Wesley's system. Wesley said: "The witness of the Spirit is an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God directly witnesses to my spirit that I am a child of God." The overemphasis on the emotional side of religion, the leanings of Wesley toward Romanticism, the subjectivism of Methodism need not be discussed in detail here, since they are familiar to the reader. While the former emotional revivalism has practically disappeared among a large portion of Methodist churches, the original spirit underlying this subjective and emotional enthusiasm still manifests itself in the empiricism of modernistic Methodists.

Thus both the *principium cognoscendi* and the message of Modernism are in accord with the theological spirit of Arminian Methodism. Modernistic Methodists have turned to Wesley's "universal and sure salvation" to find support for Modernism's formal principle. In denying that Scripture is the only source of truth, yes, in questioning the existence of *a priori* truth, they could call on Wesley as their authority. If it were true, as Wesley indicates, that the heathen is capable of salvation by living up to the standard of life which he possesses, then there can be no absolute standard, then there is no need of an absolute body of truth concerning God, His character, His plan of salvation, etc. In fact, all religious truth would be relative, the Bible only the record of man's religious experiences. Again, by basing the assurance of salvation on a subjective feeling, on Romantic mysticism, Wesley unwittingly anticipated Schleiermacher's principle that man's "God-consciousness" is the source of truth.³⁴⁾ The inevitable result of this *principium cognoscendi* is evident in the philosophy of religion developed by the leading theologians of the Methodist Boston University, notably the late Wm. P. Bowne, President Emeritus Albert C. Knudson, and Prof. Edgar S. Brighton. Known as Personalists, these men seek to find God by studying human personalities. They hold that the "ultimate reality," or God, is the only absolute personality. But to find this infinite personality, we examine our own religious experiences, study our own personalities, and finally construct a com-

33) The Methodist Church office building, a wedge-shaped structure, is directly opposite the Nation's Capitol. Is that symbolic of the prominent part which Methodists feel obliged to take in molding the character of the American people?

34) Even the neo-orthodox theologian Edwin Lewis of Drew Theological Seminary reveals this approach. See his *The Philosophy of Christian Revelation*. In many ways this book is a check on the modernistic divine immanence theory.

posite human personality, including all that is best in man, and thus arrive at a fairly accurate picture of God. This theory views the universe as a society of selves unified by the will and eminent causality of a Supreme Self, constantly striving upward and onward.³⁵⁾

The Methodist Church was the first denomination officially to adopt the social gospel. This is not surprising, for Wesley's "free salvation" by denying *total* depravity and ascribing to man inherent spiritual powers actually prepares the foundation for the "gospel" of Modernism. Every system which ascribes spiritual powers to the natural man, be it Pelagianism, Semipelagianism, or synergism, will of necessity overemphasize moral transformation and character improvement.³⁶⁾ Thus the Methodists were in a strategic position to shape the content of the Modernistic sermon. Wesley's "full salvation" had degenerated to a *social* salvation. While the Methodist Church since the days of Wesley has always taken an active part in rectifying social ills,³⁷⁾ it did not conceive of the social gospel as the Church's message until Liberalism had taken hold of American theology, i. e., about 1900. In 1907 the Methodist Federation for Social Service was organized, whose platform was that the Kingdom of God could not come as long as industrial peace, social justice, and political integrity did not prevail.³⁸⁾ In 1912 the Methodist Church adopted the Social Creed, a program for the improvement of society in its social, industrial, and political relations.³⁹⁾ The Methodist Church as a church body is attempting

35) Wieman and Meland, *op. cit.*, pp. 132—145, 318—325. Knudson, *Present Tendencies in Religious Thought*, *passim*. E. S. Brightman, *Temporalist View of God*. *Journal of Religion*, XII, p. 544 ff. E. S. Rudisill, "Personalism and Christian Thinking," *Lutheran Church Quarterly*, April, 1941. — Brightman goes so far as to deny that God is the absolute personality and says that "God is still going through His growing pains," for the holy will of the absolute reality is still striving with His "Given," the cause of evil. *Christian Century*, 1939, in the series of thirty-three articles, "How My Mind Has Changed."

36) "It (going to church) gives him a Christian philosophy of life and a religious experience out of which he builds a character of purity and integrity." *Why Go to Church?* p. 53, a tract prepared for the laymen of the former Southern Methodist Church.

37) Early Methodists supported Wilberforce, the emancipation apostle, and Oastler, the crusader against child labor. Methodists have usually been the champions of the social and economic "underdogs." In the United States many leaders in the Anti-Saloon League have been Methodists, notably such men as the late Bishop James Cannon, Jr.

38) C. H. Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel*, p. 289.

39) The Social Creed of 1912 reads as follows: "We stand for equal rights and complete justice for all men in all stations of life; for the principle of conciliation and arbitration in industrial dissensions; for the protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, occupational diseases, injuries, and mortality; for the abolition of child labor; for

to render to God the same things its members are obligated as citizens to render to Caesar. The Methodist bishops in their episcopal letter of 1942 admonished their constituency to maintain and increase the "social gains."⁴⁰ Harris F. Hall sees in the Kingdom of God the human race ruling itself and the world of Nature.⁴¹ The leading Methodist church paper said that two domestic problems of vast importance would confront the 1944 General Conference, *the labor and the farm problems*, and that "it will be impossible to discuss the kingdom of heaven on earth in 1944 and ignore the issues involved in these two areas."⁴² The best-known Methodist of our times is no doubt E. Stanley Jones. According to a reviewer he states in his recent book, *The Christ of the American Road*: "American Christianity must take what it has—the American heritage and characteristics—and make something out of them. We must offer to God the raw materials of our heritage and accomplishments so that together we may produce an American interpretation of the Kingdom of God . . . and make our very land in some real measure a miniature of that Kingdom."⁴³

The Presbyterian Church

Theologically there is little difference between Presbyterianism and Congregationalism, and during the early decades of the nineteenth century under the Plan of Union (1801) the two bodies worked together in close harmony. But while the Congregational churches fell an easy prey to Liberalism, the Presbyterian churches presented a solid front against the attempts to liberalize theology. In fact, the Presbyterians practice doctrinal discipline, something that is unheard of among Congregational and the Calvinistic Baptist

such regulations of the conditions of labor for women as shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community; for the suppression of the 'sweating system'; for the gradual and reasonable reduction of the hours of labor to the lowest practical point, with work for all; and for that degree of leisure for all which is the condition of the highest human life; for a release from employment one day in seven; for a living wage in every industry; for the highest wage that each industry can afford, and for the most equitable division of the products of industry that can ultimately be devised; for the recognition of the Golden Rule and the mind of Christ as the supreme law of society and the sure remedy for all social ills." Hopkins, *op. cit.*, p. 291. This creed has been elaborated and extended by subsequent General Conventions and is now an integral part of the *Discipline*, pp. 555–558. — Incidentally, the *Discipline* also contains specific instructions for Committees on Public Morals, Temperance, Wartime Prohibition, Conditions of Peace, Church and Economics, pp. 560–577.

40) *Christian Advocate*, 1942, pp. 7, 8.

41) *Op. cit.*, 1942, p. 250.

42) *Op. cit.*, Sept. 9, 1943, pp. 4, 5.

43) *Christian Century*, Oct. 4, 1944, p. 1137.

churches.⁴⁴⁾ This loyalty of the Presbyterians to their confessions for almost 300 years is due in a large measure to their presbyterian form of government. The Presbyterian Church is a constitutional church, i. e., the government is vested in representative courts, or judicatories, viz., the session, the presbytery, the synod, and the general assembly. The members of these courts are the teaching elder as God's messenger and the ruling elders as the congregation's representative. These courts must determine all questions of doctrine and life according to the "constitution" of the Church, the confessions, and the discipline.⁴⁵⁾ Granting to the constituted judicatories the right to require obedience to the laws of Christ and to exclude the "disobedient," the Presbyterian Church rigidly adhered to its "constitution" as long as the respective judicatories remained faithful.⁴⁶⁾ Conversely, however, when Liberal Theology gained the upper hand in the judicatories, especially in the General Assembly, then Liberalism and Modernism controlled virtually the entire denomination. This seems to be an explanation of the fact that Presbyterianism was not disturbed seriously by Modernism until the second decade of the present century, but that within a year's time it became an issue of violent proportions, whereas in other denominations Modernism entered slowly, almost imperceptibly.⁴⁷⁾ The issues in the Fundamental-Modernistic Controversy in the Presbyterian Church revolved in the final analysis not so much about doctrine, but about *church law*. The Modernists won, because they had carefully observed all the niceties and

44) Heresy trials were not uncommon among the Presbyterians, note, e. g., the trials of Albert Barnes, 1832—36; David Swing, 1874; Charles Briggs, 1892; Preserved Smith, 1893. L. A. Loettscher, *Brief History of the Presbyterians*, pp. 66, 67. R. E. Thompson, *History of Presbyterian Churches*, *passim*.

45) *Census Report*, 1936, II, p. 1382. The procedures to be followed in carrying out the "administrative and judicial discipline" are minutely described in the *Constitution* (the 1936 edition numbers 479 pages) and the *Manual* (390 pages). See especially *The Constitution*, p. 339ff.

46) In the early decades of the nineteenth century a serious controversy disturbed American Presbyterians, known as the "New and Old School Controversy." The "New Light" group contended that conversion was more essential to a minister's qualifications than learning. This was interpreted as Arminianism and emotionalism. The Old School, which finally won, remained faithful to the Calvinistic tradition.

47) Of course, the beginnings of Modernism among the Presbyterians may be traced to the work of the Presbyterian Stelzle, who preached to groups of workingmen not to "increase the population of heaven, but to bring heaven down to earth." Hopkins, *op. cit.*, p. 282; to liberal tendencies of the Presbyterian theological schools Union and Auburn Seminaries and to such theologians as A. C. McGiffert and W. A. Brown. The incipient modernistic spirit is reflected also in the 1903 revision of the Westminster Confession toward a more liberal interpretation of the Calvinistic twofold election. *Popular Symbolics*, p. 245; E. H. Rian, *The Presbyterian Conflict*, p. 17ff.

technicalities of Presbyterian law. In discussing the issues of this controversy with Presbyterians who left the Church as well as with those who remained within the Church, the outsider gains the definite impression that loyalty to the presbyterian form of government was the deciding factor in this controversy. This loyalty to a human principle elevated to the position of divine ordinance explains why such staunch Bible believers as Wm. J. Bryan continued to hold important positions in the Presbyterian Church. He wrote a beautiful defense of the "Five Points,"⁴⁸⁾ and though a member of the Committee to examine and report on the Auburn Affirmation, he did not register an official protest against the open denial of the truth.⁴⁹⁾ It seems that the lawyer was dominated by Presbyterian law.

Modernism used the very bulwark of Presbyterian orthodoxy, the Presbyterian Constitution, to break down the walls of Presbyterian confessionalism.⁵⁰⁾ H. E. Fosdick, "associate pastor" of the First Presbyterian Church in New York (though a Baptist), in the famous sermon "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" brought the conflict between Modernism and Fundamentalism to a head in the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.⁵¹⁾ The Philadelphia Presbytery, under the leadership of Clarence Macartney, following constitutional procedure, overtured the 1923 General Assembly to make the preaching of the New York Presbytery conform to the Presbyterian standards. Though the "inclusivists" (unity in spite of doctrinal differences) elected their candidate for the moderatorsip by twenty-four votes over Wm. J. Bryan (purity in doctrine), the General Assembly decided against the New York Presbytery. It furthermore resolved to reaffirm the "Five Points" of 1910, viz., the five "essential doctrines of the Word of God and Presbyterian standards" on Inspiration, the Virgin Birth, the Vicarious Atonement, the resurrection of Christ, and the miracles of Jesus. The liberal element, however, believed itself sufficiently strong to challenge the right of the Assembly to adopt the "Five Points." The New York Presbytery licensed H. P. Van Dusen (now president-elect of Union Seminary) shortly after the convention, though he

48) Reprinted in Vanderlaan, *op. cit.*, pp. 32—39.

49) Rian, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

50) This chapter of Presbyterian history is described by E. H. Rian, *op. cit.*, and H. M. Griffiths, *The Case for Compromise*. Both authors are Fundamentalists and left the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. S. G. Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*.

51) The opponents of the Liberal Theology, which had already taken firm hold in some denominations during the first decade of the nineteenth century, became known as Fundamentalists, when, beginning in 1909, twelve booklets called *The Fundamentals* were distributed gratis by two laymen to all Protestant ministers. The Fundamentalists were also known as Essentialists.

refused to affirm the Virgin Birth. In December of the same year a large number of Presbyterian ministers issued the Auburn Affirmation. This is an out-and-out liberal document. But the Auburn Affirmationists were able to foist their Liberalism upon the Church under the guise that the General Assembly had transgressed its constitutional rights. The gist of this lengthy document is: 1. The General Assembly had no constitutional right to elevate the five doctrines as special tests for ordination. This right is vested in the presbyteries, and the Assembly cannot act in this matter without concurrence of the respective presbyteries, which, however, it had failed to do in 1923. 2. The "Five Points" are not doctrines taught in Scripture or in the standards, but only theories concerning these facts.⁵²⁾ The first point was technically correct. The inclusivists tried to find legal support for their Liberalism in the second point. Following the letter, but not the spirit, of the Constitution, the Modernists were able to maintain their membership in the Presbyterian Church while advocating rank Modernism. Thus the Presbyterian Constitution, intended by its framers to safeguard "orthodoxy," became the lever to open the floodgates and permit the tide of Modernism to submerge Fundamentalism. Princeton, the bulwark of Calvinistic theology under Warfield and Machen, became modernistic under the leadership of Stevenson. Dr. Machen himself, the stalwart champion of Calvinistic orthodoxy, was suspended from the Presbyterian Church, not because of heresy, but because of an infraction of Presbyterian law. He had organized the Independent Board for Missions, because the regular Board was supporting modernistic missionaries. He was ordered to disband his board, which he refused to do, and was suspended for insub-

52) The salient paragraph in the Affirmation reads as follows: "This opinion of the General Assembly attempts to commit our Church to certain theories concerning the inspiration of the Bible, and the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, and the Continuing Life and Supernatural Power of our Lord Jesus Christ. We all hold most earnestly to these great facts and doctrines; we all believe from our hearts that the writers of the Bible were inspired of God; that Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh; that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, and through Him we have redemption; that having died for our sins He rose from the dead and is our ever-living Savior; that in His earthly ministry He wrought many mighty works, and by His vicarious death and unfailling presence He is able to save to the uttermost. Some of us regard the particular theories contained in the deliverance of the General Assembly of 1923 as satisfactory explanations of these facts and doctrines. But we are united in believing that these are not the only theories allowed by the Scriptures and our standards as explanations of these facts and doctrines of our religion and that all who hold to these facts and doctrines, whatever theories they may employ to explain them, are worthy of all confidence and fellowship." Rian, *op. cit.*, 291-297.

ordination, disobedience toward Presbyterian church law. This chapter in recent church history shows clearly that human devices, e. g., the presbyterian form of government with all the proposed safeguards, cannot preserve the Church from error. Only God's Word can effect that.

The Federal Council of Churches

The statement is frequently made that Modernism with the social gospel is definitely on the decline. It is true that gross Modernism with its humanism and optimism of twenty-five years ago is no longer popular. It is stated that Barthian dialectical theology, often spoken of as Neo-Orthodoxy, has completely discredited Liberalism and that the awful fact of two wars in one generation has taken the wind out of Modernism's sails. But the death of Liberalism has been grossly exaggerated.⁵³⁾ The basic elements of Modernism and Liberal Theology still remain in large areas of the theological world. But the point of emphasis has changed. The competence of science to determine religious truths has been successfully challenged; the capacity of man for self-salvation is seriously questioned; in fact, the premises and the findings of Liberalism are being re-studied and re-examined. It is too early to predict the direction in which the Modernists will go.⁵⁴⁾

That Liberal Theology will be with us for some time to come, seems quite evident as one examines the theology and the program of the Federal Council. While many leading theologians seemingly are floundering theologically, the leadership of the Federal Council

53) Liberalism still is a vital issue, as is evident from Roberts and Van Dusen, *Liberal Theology*, 1942. Cp. also two anthologies by Thos. S. Kepler, *Contemporary Religious Thought* and *Contemporary Thinking About Jesus*. Five years ago the *Christian Century* published a series of thirty-three statements by prominent theologians: "How My Mind Has Changed." Some had shifted their position, but men like Luccock said that they were Liberals still. The surveys of religious books edited annually by Chas. Macfarland show that Liberalism is still active. Cp. Wm. K. Anderson, *Protestantism; A Symposium*, 1944, a Methodist publication in the liberal tradition. Wieman and Meland, *op. cit.*, will be of value in classifying the present leaders in Liberal Theology. Edwin A. Burt, *Types of Religious Philosophy*, also is an attempt to characterize the leading streams of theological thought.

54) A word of caution is probably in order: The terminology employed by present modernistic theologians is often misleading. In some circles Neo-Supranaturalism means that as of today there are truths above nature, but what is supranatural today may be within the reach of human understanding a century from now. The term revelation is interpreted to denote those religious experiences of man which are the result of divine intervention. The word *cross* is a symbol of divine *agape* vs. human *eros*. Eschatology is the belief that the Kingdom of God through a catastrophe and judgment upon man's sin will be established at some future point in history.

is committed to Liberal Theology.⁵⁵⁾ The same is true concerning the social gospel. The purpose of the Federal Council according to its constitution is the application of the principles of the social gospel.⁵⁶⁾ The program which at present is occupying the Federal Council concerns itself with such peace terms as are in keeping with their modernistic concept of the Kingdom of God. The bases for a just and durable peace, as submitted by the Council's committee under the chairmanship of John Foster Dulles, are political and moral, and are in all essentials along the lines of the social gospel.⁵⁷⁾ Since the influence of the Federal Council seems to go unabated, it is reasonable to assume that Modernism, especially the social gospel, will confront the churches for some time. The American activism seems to find an outlet in this theology. As Lutheran theologians we must be on our guard lest on the one hand we become enamored of this theology and consider it our duty to match the social activities of the Reformed churches, and lest on the other hand in our attempt to avoid the pitfalls of the social gospel we completely ignore the social implications of the Gospel.

The rise of Liberalism and the social gospel in the Reformed churches quite naturally raises the question: Is there something in the genius of Lutheranism which has preserved the Lutheran Church from Modernism? The answer is that by God's grace the *Sola Scriptura* principle of the Lutheran Reformation is taken seriously among Lutherans. This principle of necessity demands a confession of our faith in strict accordance with the Word of God. The formal principle of the Reformed churches leads to doctrinal indifference, yes even to anti-credalism, but the Lutheran formal principle makes creeds an inner necessity for Christians.⁵⁸⁾ The Lutheran Confessions meet this need. The Lutheran Confessions, as the confessions of no other Church, lead directly into the very heart of the Bible, the doctrine of justification. Yes, this doctrine becomes the *leitmotif* of all theology. And where that is the case,

55) *Presbyterian Guardian*, Doctrinal Complexion of Federal Council, 1944, p. 215ff. The author draws heavily on John A. Hutchinson, *We Are Not Divided*. H. Hinz, *The Federal Council*, a B. D. thesis submitted to the faculty of Concordia Seminary.

56) "To secure a larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life." *The Constitution*, Article IV.

57) *The Churches and a Just and Durable Peace* (Christian Century Press) contains the findings of the Delaware Conference in 1942. *Forward Together*, published by the Federal Council, outlines plans for unified action on the part of various agencies in the fields of social service.

58) Krauth, C. P., *The Conservative Reformation*, p. 166f.

there every doctrine, though it may seem of secondary importance, becomes a rich treasure, and there "purity of doctrine becomes such a first," as Krauth says, "that there can be no second." The Lutheran Confessions based on the Scriptures alone contain the clear-cut answer to every "ism" which has plagued or may plague the Church. Traditionalism (acceptance of human authority), enthusiasm (religious experience), Pelagianism (man is capable of self-salvation), rationalism (liberal theology), humanism (improvement of society by education and training), and unionism, all these isms are irrevocably denounced in the Lutheran Confessions. Our solemn obligation is to make these Confessions our own by a whole-hearted subscription to them,⁵⁹⁾ and to pass them on to those who today are floundering theologically. That should be our contribution to true unity, as Sasse points out.⁶⁰⁾

All of this, however, means that we must study and re-study our Lutheran Confessions. Purity of doctrine demands that we take the confessors' exhortation seriously when they "most earnestly exhort" that the young men preparing for the ministry study the Confessions diligently, so that the pure doctrine be preserved and propagated to our posterity.⁶¹⁾ And in 1877 Dr. Walther wrote these earnest words: "My dear Lutheran Christians, let us consider the tremendous sacrifices which our fathers brought in order to gain for us this treasure (the confessional writings). What indescribable labors, what numerous prayers, sighs, and tears, what time in study and travel did they sacrifice! Let us under no circumstances be found carelessly squandering this treasure, for which our fathers labored and fought at tremendous sacrifices (*erarbeitet und erkämpft haben*). Let us here in America take a warning from our unfortunate fatherland, which has spurned this treasure."⁶²⁾

F. E. MAYER

59) See the splendid statement on the *quia* subscription in Schmauck, *The Confessional Principle*, p. 91.

60) *Here We Stand*, pp. 86ff., 180.

61) Triglotta, p. 21.

62) *Der Konkordienformel Kern und Stern*, p. 78f.



A Review of Moehlman's "School and Church: The American Way" *

Which is "the American way" for the religious training of American children? According to Dr. C. H. Moehlman, Professor of the History of Christianity at the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, the American way is a different one from that pursued in Christian parochial schools. It is different, too, from the plan of "various religious groups" who "are conducting a vigorous propaganda for the return of the formal teaching of religion to the public classroom" (p. ix). The American way is to let public schools (in preference to parochial schools) and churches exist side by side, and to encourage them in at least much of the work they are now doing.

Dr. Moehlman is ready to give encouragement to the public school. His book, published this year, was written "in defense of public education" (p. ix). He is not so sure that the work of the Church can receive unqualified endorsement. "What must the American Christian churches do to be saved? Certainly not engage in a costly and futile struggle to reintroduce formal Bible study and catechism into public education. Let them rather undergird the indirect religious approach of our public schools by teaching their own constituency the principles and applications of religion which have weathered the attack of the power age" (p. 135).

Anyone who is familiar with the idiom of the representatives of the social gospel and of religious Modernism will understand when we say that Dr. Moehlman's book is one of the most vicious attacks launched in recent times against all that truly Christian churches and genuinely Christian schools stand for.

School and Church is not primarily an attack on the parochial school, although Dr. Moehlman devotes two chapters (5 and 6) to an unfavorable review of that institution. What makes Dr. Moehlman's book abhorrent to orthodox Christians is his rejection of the authority of the Bible, the permanency of Christian creeds, the sinfulness of man, the need of redemption, and the otherworldliness of the Christian religion, and his substitution of a religion of ethics and brotherly love. His attitude toward the basic concepts of Christianity, however, vitiates this whole educational philosophy.

Dr. Moehlman's "defense of public education" is not an attempt to safeguard the political rights and the legal status of the public school. In his discussion he becomes rather an apologist for the excellence, in fact, for the superior merit of the public school system. The advantage of the public school, he argues, is

* Moehlman, C. H.; *School and Church: The American Way*. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1944. X and 178 pages. \$2.50.

twofold. First, it recognizes that "religion cannot be taught formally, but must be absorbed indirectly" (p. 95). Secondly, it has succeeded in preserving the "values of religion" (pp. X, 97). Indeed, "the public school in a certain sense . . . is more distinctively the expression of the faith of all the people than the church" (p. 97).

The first of these two propositions is bad enough. Since when do "religious instruction and public education require very different atmospheres, attitudes, and methods" (p. 97)? It may be true that "the religious mood cannot be created by folding one's hands and naming the kings of Israel and the twelve apostles" (*ibid.*) — and some teachers of religion are justly censured by this passing dig at purely intellectual teaching — but why single out memorization items from a course of religious instruction? Moreover, the truth is that the "religious mood" is not an indispensable (although, of course, eminently desirable) accompaniment to profitable religious instruction. Many a Christian soldier has testified that passages which he had learned somewhat unwillingly and in a mood which was far from devotional have come home to him now and have belatedly but efficiently succeeded in establishing a "religious mood."

But the monstrously erroneous conception underlying Dr. Moehlman's educational philosophy finds expression particularly in his second statement, the contention that "the values of religion have always been in public education" (p. 27). Repeatedly he fulminates against those who speak of the "godless public school." "God was not banished from 'our schools' by Horace Mann" (p. 94). "What escapes the observation of so many investigators is that public education has not walked out on religion" (p. 97). "To call public education 'godless' betrays invincible ignorance, infinite prejudice, and complete misunderstanding of what religion is all about" (p. 98).

Evidently the question is in order, What does Mr. Moehlman mean by "religion"? He does not mean the doctrines which orthodox Christian churches have derived from the Bible. His discussion, conducted in the early chapters of *School and Church* from an ostensible objective and "historical" viewpoint, loses the dispassionate tone in later chapters and is marked instead by scorn and contempt for the presumably unscientific and unscholarly beliefs of Fundamentalists.

The reason why Dr. Moehlman rejects orthodox religious views is that he rejects the "traditional Christian mood toward an understanding of the Bible" (p. 109) as a source book of doctrine. The Bible, he declares, is not "static, absolute, authoritarian truth," but is valuable only because it gives information about bygone ages. "All that body of first-century knowledge has only archaeological

significance. Knowledge of the original meanings of Biblical terminology, ideas, and ideology turns the historical student of the Bible into an historian of a slight area of the ancient world, and that is all" (p. 108). "What recent advocates of the formal teaching of religion in the public school fail to appreciate is that the Bible which disappeared from the classroom as a religious text in the late nineteenth century has also disappeared from history." "The dogmatic Bible of yesterday has evolved into the historical Bible of today. But the Bible historically evaluated can never be harmonized with the Bible verbally inspired in every 'i' and 't'" (page 120).

The truth is, says Dr. Moehlman, that "the Bible historically understood is exceedingly dangerous to the inherited traditional faith of the American child, whether in a Catholic or an orthodox Protestant church" (p. 121). The historical view of the Bible will show that orthodox dogma is not eternal truth, but ecclesiastical fiction. "Christianity has imposed the doctrine of original sin and all that has followed in its train upon a Bible utterly innocent of it" (*ibid.*). "Jesus seems unacquainted with man corrupted by an ancient fall." (P. 130. — But see John 3:3-6 and Matt. 15:18-20!) "The idea of sin is a primitive one. The story in Gen. 3 is an attempt to explain the origin of various ills to which mankind is subject, such as hard labor, pain in childbearing, etc. The sin here recorded was the violation of a taboo. After the sin had been committed, God feared that man would eat of the fruit of another tree, the tree of life, and thus magically become immortal; to avoid this, God punished man by expulsion from the garden. The Christian idea of total depravity, derived from the story, 'in Adam's fall, we sinned all,' is foreign to Old Testament thought" (p. 104).

"It was the Roman government which arrested, tried, and condemned Jesus to death. . . . Crucifixion was the Roman method of execution. Jesus was crucified on the charge of treason against the Roman state. Faith in his non-political messianity originated after the crucifixion and in Galilee under the leadership of Peter. The 'last supper' preceded the slaying of the passover lamb and was a 'Kiddush,' not a Christian communion service. The church at Jerusalem celebrated a rite known as the 'breaking of the bread' and was not familiar with the 'Lord's Supper.' Jesus became *soter* (Savior) only much later" (p. 119 f.). "Jesus did not die as a religious prophet, but upon the charge of revolution" (p. 130).

After designating as "ancient folklore" the stories about Balaam, Jonah, Daniel, and the serpent that conversed with Eve, Dr. Moehlman asserts: "Today, in the presence of a fully developed science of Biblical criticism, the Reformers' view of the Bible, interpretation of history, and philosophy of life cannot be ours.

If the earlier Protestant confessions of faith are at all to be accepted today by the intelligent laity, it must be on the assumption of re-evaluation in accordance with contemporary knowledge. The American environment endorses the scientific approach to the problem of the Bible" (p. 130 f.). In the chapter "Can the Bible Return to the Classroom?" Dr. Moehlman states: "It is trite to observe that the world of the twentieth century and the world of the first are incommensurable. The Christian ideology of the first century and that of the twentieth are not identical. . . . The fundamentalist preacher seems to be expounding the Bible as written, and the people like to hear him. That he is not doing this is not at all present in the minds of his audience" (p. 108 f.).

But Dr. Moehlman does not merely deny that "the fundamentalist interpretation of the gospels" (p. 160) possesses value today. He charges orthodox teachers with actually having been the cause of much social damage and harm. "Our contention is that the usual literalistic treatment of the following New Testament texts" [Matt. 27:15; John 19:15; Acts 2:23, and others] "has made it possible for the Christian conscience to look back upon the sufferings of Jews through the centuries with a calmness and indifference of which the non-Christian world has never been guilty . . . By divine decree which was entered on the ledgers of heaven before the foundation of the world, because God had foreseen this base denial of Jesus before the Roman procurator, the Jews have been condemned to indescribable humiliation and suffering since A. D. 30. This interpretation" [of Acts 2:23] "has made it possible for devout Christians to condone the imposition of heavy penalties upon the Jews by king, emperor, dictator, crusader, mob. Apparently the Jewish hope of escape from brutality rests with historical-minded Christians and the non-Christian world, which is unfamiliar with this peculiarly Christian ideology" (p. 160 f.). "John 19:16 is a slander contradicted by the whole history of Israel and Judaism" (page 130).

Since Dr. Moehlman rejects the orthodox conception of "religion," what does he understand by that term? For him religion consists of ethical precepts and moral behavior. "Vital religion" is not "narrow denominationalism. It is the pursuit of the good life. It is reverence for the human personality. It is dependence upon God" (p. 126). Deeds, not creeds, constitute religion. "The tragedy of Protestantism is that its theology was 'crystallized into creeds which are still held binding on the great Protestant churches' before genuine historical method had come to birth, before natural science had formulated its mode of procedure, and before the advent of the critical philosophy" (p. 130). Today "religion has become functional rather than institutional, and education has become 'the

acquisition of competency to interpret life' " (p. 101). Hence the student must be taught that "with the rest of humanity he forms a world brotherhood. What he needs most is" [not faith in Christ's redemptive work but] "stability, balance, the power to be patient and to endure, and intelligent optimism. There will always be mystery in life, as there has always been. What counts is the way one takes his failures and successes" (p. 100 f.).

Religion, Dr. Moehlman pontificates further, must be "intellectually defensible" (p. 133). It appreciates and understands what science solves and explains. "Religion is concerned with awe, wonder, reverence, mystery, the unknown, faith in God. It must get rid of its ancient shells which prevent the new life from expressing itself" (p. 133). Having social obligations, "religion must bring the ways and methods of society and the state before the judgment bar of the Eternal" (p. 134). Furthermore, "religion must face the future, not the past, if it would lead" (p. 135). That means that "literalism" must be abandoned and that "the church of the twentieth century which identifies the ideal with some ancient expression of the ideal commits the unpardonable sin" (*ibid.*).

The "age-long development of religion," Dr. Moehlman declares, has proved the following faith to be tenable at all times:

1. Religion has been not only the quest of God, but the quest of the higher cultural values as well.

2. Religion is indestructible, because it originates on the borderline between the known and the unknown.

3. The choice before man is not that of religion or no religion, but of what kind of religion. Shall it be a religion of superstition, of magic and cruelty, or a religion of intelligence, beauty, and ethics?

4. Religion at its best desires to teach that love is at the heart of the world. When the total record is in, the universe will be seen to be dependable and good (p. 135 f.).

Proceeding from premises of that nature, Dr. Moehlman can logically find "the values of religion" in public education. After listing the aims of public education as formulated by the Educational Policies Commission (self-realization, human relationships, economic efficiency, civil responsibility), Dr. Moehlman asserts: "Accepting this description of the objectives of public education, it is clear that the values of religion are present in each of the four main objectives" (p. 98). Arguing the same point, he states that "one may turn to the statement published by the National Education Association only to discover that the religious emphasis is again indirectly present. The seven aims there mentioned — health,

command of fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocation, citizenship, worthy use of leisure time, and ethical character—have been the handmaids of religion from the dawn of conscience until today" (*ibid.*). Although "formal religious exercises have disappeared from public education," Dr. Moehlman insists that "reverence has increased. 'Appreciation of health, love of beauty, enjoyment of intellectual discovery, devotion to freedom and democracy, interest in play and recreation, social uses of wealth and invention, the enrichment of social fellowship, and the spirit of altruism permeating all relationships are no less than in colonial days.'" (P. 101 f.) These are the values of religion!

These are the reasons why Dr. Moehlman asserts that "far from being 'godless,' the public schools are the principal instruments for the perpetuation of religious values among us. In fact, the religion of public education is a more powerful factor in American life today than that of the churches" (p. x). The latter statement is probably only too true, but it is not true that "functionally viewed, American public education emancipated from sectarianism is indirectly the only universal teacher of religious values in the United States" (p. 85). Religious values comprise much more than the aims of public education, and even these can be truly achieved only by the Gospel proclaimed by orthodox churches.

Dr. Moehlman has a message, however, also for the churches of America, especially for the great church bodies that subscribe, at least officially, to orthodox beliefs. *They should change their religion.* He warns them that "what has actually occurred in the U. S. since the adoption of Amendment I has been the gradual depreciation of the Christian Church as an institution of religious control and the corresponding appreciation of Christianity as a functional value in American life" (p. 59 f.). He contends that "through lack of historical perspective and the lamentable mistakes of their leadership, many of the Christian bodies in the United States have lost connection with on-going life" (p. 128). He reminds them that their "philosophy of supernaturalism, constancy, theology, discipline, and miracle" will be difficult to maintain, because on every hand they are confronted by "assumptions of law, change, scientific method, adaptation, and process" (p. 80). He counsels: "If Christianity would live vigorously in the American environment, it must apply faith and hope and love to the problems of today and emphasize principles and attitudes of primary concern to the American way of life." (P. 135.—See also p. 133.) And he concludes his book with this challenge: "A desperate world looks to Christian leadership to help. If that leadership instead of defending its mistakes and its passing dogmas could only appreciate its opportunity in the world it so naively calls 'materialistic,' the

will of God might at last be done on earth. Alas, within the churches the millenarian fever is rising, not subsiding, and 'apostolical succession' and sacramentalism are gaining in Protestantism. Must a waiting world in the interest of world peace turn even further away from organized Christianity to achieve world brotherhood?" (P. 136 f.)

It is high time that the churches adopt the religion of ethics. Such a step would help them to see not only that "the values of religion have remained in the public school" (p. x), but also that the political structure of our nation is itself religious. "Our American democracy comprehends the values in Christianity. The older forms, expressions, and postulates of religion are rapidly vanishing among our intellectuals. Traditional Christianity is disintegrating so far as its institutional manifestations are concerned. But the Christianity that can never die, that has functional value, is interwoven with all our democratic activities" (p. 125). "For all Americans the postulates of the democratic way are also sincere religious convictions. . . . American democracy subscribes to tolerance, sympathetic understanding, religious idealism" (pp. 124, 125 f.). Orthodox Christians will go along with Dr. Moehlman in saying that patriotism is part of their religion and an expression of it. For men of Dr. Moehlman's type, however, good citizenship is the essence and acme of religion. Odd? Well, what do you expect of a man who intimates that the American "Old Testament" is Washington's Farewell Address and its "New Testament" Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, or who asserts that our "poems and hymns about Washington and Lincoln stir deep religious emotions"? (P. 124.)

Thus the principal error of Dr. Moehlman's discussion is a theological fallacy, and an evaluation of his book must be conducted on a theological basis. The great gulf between the standpoint of men like the author of *School and Church* and our own churchmen is caused by the difference of opinion as to the "values of religion." These values are not primarily the ones mentioned by Dr. Moehlman. The Christian religion places chief emphasis on a transformed heart. "Ye must be born again" is its humiliating reminder. "Repent, and believe the Gospel" is its universal message. If the principles underlying the story of Calvary have been adopted by a man, the ethical changes which men of Moehlman's stripe so dearly love to call "the values of religion" will be forthcoming, for as soon as a man is in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature (2 Cor. 5:7) — and not before! To speak of "the values of religion" without emphasizing the Gospel's *principal value* as a heart-transforming, faith-begetting agency is a gross and tragic distortion of Scriptural truth.

It is that kind of loose talk that prompted Dr. J. Gresham Machen to say in regard to "character education" in public schools: "What surprises me about this program is not that its advocates propose it; for it is only too well in accord with the spirit of the age. But what really surprises me about it is that the advocates seem to think that a Christian can support it without ceasing at that point to be Christian. . . . Character building, as practiced in our public schools, may well prove to be character destruction. . . . If the Law of God is proclaimed in public schools, to people of different faiths, it is bound, in the very nature of the case, to be proclaimed with optimism; and if it is proclaimed with optimism, it is proclaimed in a way radically opposed to the Christian doctrine of sin. By hypothesis it is regarded as all that good citizens imperatively need to know; they may perhaps profitably know other things, but the fundamental notion is that if they know this, they know all that is absolutely essential. But is not a Law that is proclaimed to unredeemed persons with such optimism at best only an imperfect, garbled Law? Is it not very different from the true and majestic Law of God with its awful pronouncements of eternal death upon sinful man? The answer to these questions is only too plain. A proclamation of morality which regards itself as all that is necessary . . . is very different from that true proclamation of the Law of God which may be a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ. It is not merely insufficient, but it is false; and I do not see how a consistent Christian can possibly regard it as providing any part of that nurture and admonition of the Lord which it is the duty of every Christian parent to give to his children" (*The Necessity of the Christian School*, pp. 10—12).

The Lutheran confessional writings say the same thing when they declare: "The adversaries consider only the precepts of the Second Table, which contains civil righteousness that reason understands. Content with this, they think that they satisfy the Law of God. In the meantime they do not see the First Table, which commands that we love God. . . . But the human heart, without the Holy Ghost, either in security despises God's judgment, or in punishment flees from, and hates, God, when He judges. Therefore it does not obey the First Table. Since, therefore, contempt of God and doubt concerning the threats and promises inhere in human nature, men truly *sin* even when, without the Holy Ghost, they do virtuous works, because they do them with a wicked heart" (Apology, *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 129 f.).

Anyone who has not grasped the far-reaching and sinister theological implications in an assertion which contends that "the values of religion" are present in the non-religious educational program of the public school, will find it difficult, if not impossible,

to see why we say that we cannot agree with the conclusions reached by Dr. Moehlman in *School and Church*.

On the other hand, all who recognize the significance of Dr. Moehlman's statements about "the values of religion" will see clearly how completely Dr. Moehlman contradicts the Bible when he declares: "The religious element in public education is everything that promotes faith in the higher values of life. Religion is not something apart, but a continuous part of our experience. Public education is designed to prepare the American child to live creatively in the American environment. Although the public school may not and should not teach religion directly, everyone should understand that public education always has inculcated religious and ethical attitudes indirectly. And we submit that these emphases matter more than the names of the kings of Israel or of the apostles and an alphabetical list of scripture verses" (p. 100). When Dr. Moehlman says that "public education is concerned about citizenship and character and the integration of personality" (p. 95), he has mentioned the essence of the "religion" about which he is concerned. That is why he is satisfied when public school activities are based on "ideas and ideals that seek to develop successful living" (p. 100). Ethics is his religion.

Thus Dr. Moehlman's reason for opposing the teaching of religion in public schools is by no means based primarily on political considerations. Any Lutheran who welcomes Dr. Moehlman's assertions with "Hurrah! Here is a man who speaks our language and shares our views in regard to separation of Church and State" betrays his ignorance of the author's objectives.

Dr. Moehlman's arguments against the return of formal religious training to the public classroom (p. 126) may be summarized as follows: Religion cannot be taught (pp. 95, 97, 100), and dogma should not be taught in the public classroom. ("No dogmatic reconstruction of the historical facts would long be tolerated." — P. 131.) Moreover, religious instruction in the public school is not practicable. Because of the variety of opinions represented among the pupils, "some other way must be found to make the churches more effective in the American way of life" (p. 122). This is true enough, but Dr. Moehlman holds that the absence of religious instruction constitutes no serious loss. "The reply of public education to those churchmen who continue to insist that religion has a monopoly on character education might well be: So sorry, but psychologists, penologists, psychiatrists, and criminologists doubt your claims" (p. 127). In fact, religious knowledge is said by Dr. Moehlman to be in dire need of supplementary agencies if it is to achieve practical results. "The longer a student studies the Bible historically, the more exact data he gets on first-century Christianity,

and the less competent he becomes in Christian work of today, unless at the same time, by work in history, philosophy, psychology, ethics, and so on, he learns how to re-evaluate his first-century materials" (p. 108). Because the public school operates directly or indirectly with these supplementary influences, and because it recognizes that "knowledge has become relative, instrumental, and fragmentary" and that "experience is basic and induction the method of learning" (p. 94), public education is doing a good job of preserving "the values of religion." Old-fashioned Bible study would merely cumber the educational ground. Public schools, on the other hand, by being "concerned about citizenship and character and the integration of personality" (p. 95) successfully "deal with the enduring values. And this they do through the living contacts of the teachers and the taught, pupil and pupil" (p. 99).

It is in the light of these assertions about religion and the presence of the values of religion in non-religious education that we must judge Dr. Moehlman's statements about the parochial school.

Dr. Moehlman is opposed to the principle of the parochial school. He grants that "the American educational plan is twofold: tax-supported universal public education, and the recognition of values in and a benevolent attitude toward private schools" (p. 128), but his own attitude is far from benevolent. He states not only that "the parochial school is definitely on the defensive" (p. 84), but also that "contemporary public education has a formidable case against parochial systems" (p. 95).

What is that "case"? The parochial school, says Dr. Moehlman, fosters sectarianism, and "sectarianism . . . contradicts the implications of American democracy" (p. 90). Proceeding from the premise that "when separation of church and state is superimposed on a theocracy, public education must become gradually but permanently a state function" (p. 29), Dr. Moehlman points out that "the general cultural trend frowns upon any attempts to make education denominational or sectarian" (p. 95). "Education for life' cannot be sectarian, denominational, or pre-1791 in the twentieth century. It must be of a different pattern" (p. 1). Dr. Moehlman endorses Horace Mann's assertion that "the national safety, prosperity, and happiness can be obtained only through free public schools, open to all, good enough for all, attended by all" (p. 86). "The religion of the American majority is democracy" (p. ix). "Hence to some the parochial school seems to be an island within contemporary American life. The segregation of Catholic or Protestant children by the parochial school is therefore to be criticized as inimical to social welfare. Whether or not such schools are un-American in aim and present practices is often debated. It cannot be denied that it would be easily possible for the church

to condition the child's environment and limit knowledge to its own selfish ends. And whatever the aim, it is true that the segregation of children in parochial schools tends to limit the basis of common knowledge and common experience, both of which are essential to a common understanding of civic relationships" (p. 82).

The harm that parochial schools are doing is illustrated by the mischievous results of even so feeble an attempt as the released-time plan of religious instruction. "New evils begin to make their appearance. Feuds between different religious groups are growing more and more. Where formerly the race issue was no problem on the public school campus, it is becoming so because the matter was discussed in religious education on released time" (p. 132). Fortunately, "the only religion with which the great majority of American youth ever come into contact is the religion of public education, where intolerance, bigotry, and race prejudice are not at home" (p. x). But because of the harm which the churches are doing to the cause of democracy, Dr. Moehlman declares: "When the study of religion in 'released-time' religious educational classes issues in religious persecution and race clashes, public education might properly ask whether the churches do not owe it an apology" (*ibid.*).

Everything would be lovely "if Protestantism should ever be courageous enough to let the Bible be taught historically in its parochial schools" (p. 68). Then its school program, like that of public education, would become "emancipated from sectarianism" (p. 85) and from "dogmatic theology" (p. 91) and would cease trying "to dominate dogmatically men's minds" (p. 86). Then, no doubt, we should all become enlightened enough to see that the differences separating the churches are only minor and that there should be one great American Church for all who wish to attend.

At present the teaching methods of parochial schools are as wrong as their religious materials are antiquated. By implication Dr. Moehlman makes Hitler typical of the kind of pupil that is graduated from parochial schools. After quoting a statement by George Bernard Shaw that "the only remedy for war is conscience, and you will not have that until you have religion carefully taught and inculcated," Dr. Moehlman declares: "But Germany throughout the nineteenth and the twentieth century had compulsory religious education. Hitler learned the catechism and got 100 per cent." (P. 140. See also p. 80.) Evidently Deut. 6:7 does not hold for the religious training of twentieth-century children. The truth is, of course, that here, as elsewhere in his discussion, Dr. Moehlman employs a loose and slipshod kind of argumentation. Since when have orthodox teachers held that everyone who is instructed in the Christian religion will remain faithful to its principles?

Dr. Moehlman's dislike for parochial schools leads him to become guilty of exaggerations and half-truths. He insists, for example, that "the Protestant parochial school has collapsed" (p. 68), but ignores almost entirely the splendid educational work being done by the Lutheran Church, except for a brief acknowledgment that "the Lutherans account for 180,865" of the 275,643 children enrolled in Protestant parochial schools. His assertion that "Protestant parochial effort has signally failed and the necessary emotionalism for it cannot now be artificially stimulated" (p. 95) is effectively contradicted by the remarkable and healthy increase in deep interest and vigorous activity for Christian education manifested by Lutheran congregations and other American religious groups from east to west in our country.

We can agree with Dr. Moehlman when he states that one of the reasons for the decline of Protestant parochial education was this, that "financial support was too meager" (p. 68; cf. p. 84). In fact, he gives an excellent description of the colossal presumptuousness of certain Protestants who expect the State to introduce and provide religious instruction because they are too stingy to make the necessary expenditures for an adequate religious educational program by their own Church. "This type of Protestant desires religiously controlled and motivated education, and because he cannot [?] pay for it, he feels the state must. For it is unblushingly admitted that although 'week-day religious education with the co-operation of the public schools has made considerable headway, quantitatively speaking, it is but a meager attack upon the problem. The Protestant churches seem to be confronted with the choice between developing extra-school religious education on a scale hitherto unapproached or working out with other religious groups some plan whereby religious education can be incorporated in the school system.'" "Let non-Christians pay for the religious education of Protestant children and thus reduce the cost of maintaining Protestant Sunday schools" (p. 2 f.).

It is another matter, however, when the decline of parochial schools is charged to the fact that "not even at that time (1854) could parochial elementary education compare with the public brand" (p. 68) or when the statement is made that at denominational colleges "teaching faculties selected only for denominational reasons are almost always weak faculties. . . . The best men are constantly rejected, and the poorer men taken, for denominational reasons only" (p. 69) or when the "case against parochial systems" is based on the following assertions: "Some parochial schools lack competent teachers, cannot sufficiently expand their curricula to meet current needs, and must get on with inferior and inadequate equipment. 'You know that the parochial schools have never been

able to furnish education of the same standard as in our public schools" (p. 95). Carefully maintained records in bulging file folders tell an utterly different story about the efficiency of Lutheran parochial schools: they show that the graduates of Lutheran elementary schools as a rule become good and frequently top-notch students in public high schools and are frequently honored as valedictorians. They and the graduates of Lutheran high schools and colleges are in great demand among businessmen who value character and ability. When a school system like that of the Missouri Synod is staffed by more than two thousand teachers, it is bound to happen that "some parochial schools lack competent teachers," but the same condition is found in public schools, and thus the statement is gratuitous and viciously unfair.

The matter of "inferior and inadequate equipment," mentioned above, appears also on page 80, where the statement is made that the parochial system "has not the economic means to parallel the vocational training of public education." It would only disgust Dr. Moehlman to remind him that some Christian parents are so "otherworldly" in their affections that they do not regard the advantages of vocational training as being decisive in any comparison of public with parochial schools. But it may not be out of place to point to the increasing number of businessmen who emphatically demand that schools go back to stressing the three R's of education.

Another unfair charge in the "case against parochial systems" (and this one is leveled specifically at Protestant parochial schools) is the one implied in the statement: "American children should be educated as Americans" (p. 95). This is an outrageous vilification of the instruction given by parochial school teachers and of the civic attitude of parochial school graduates that hardly deserves to be answered. The truth is that hundreds of American men and women trained in Christian parochial schools have served their community and their nation well; many of them have become prominent in exemplary discharge of civic and governmental responsibilities. The statement is furthermore a slanderous misrepresentation of thousands of Christian boys and girls who are at this very hour serving with conspicuous faithfulness in the armed forces of our country and who have born enthusiastic testimony to the civic value of their parochial school training.

But the most vicious accusation Dr. Moehlman brings against parochial schools is that they teach too much religion. He quotes men who speak of church school graduates that have gone wrong (pp. 69, 80) and on the basis of their observations says: "Judge what a return to Protestant parochial schools would signify today" (p. 69). In fact, he insinuates that churches, especially the orthodox churches, are likely to become breeders of crime. He refers

to a crime study which discovered that "most criminals belong to some church and frankly admit the fact," and quotes another investigator who "associated 'the heaviest ratio of homicide with religious fundamentalism'" (p.127). We knew it all along: David's adultery and murder, Absalom's rebellion, Peter's denial—they were all the result of "too much religion." Christian teachers, you owe the American nation an apology!

It is difficult to avoid the impression that Dr. Moehlman is writing from a biased viewpoint and that he is not so much interested in facts as in giving preconceived notions the semblance of plausibility. *School and Church* reads well and brings much valuable information as it traces the development of American education. Of particular interest just now are its observations about the released-time plan (pp.131—133) and its judgment that "the released-time plan for religious education seems doomed" (p.133). Dr. Moehlman is probably right in stating that "Protestants . . . show no great interest in the released-time plan" and that "the desire of children for released-time periods can hardly be called pronounced" (p.132). For the most part, however, *School and Church* is a false guide in matters of religious education. Its view of the past is heavily colored by prejudices, and its predictions for the future are marked largely by wishful thinking.

Basic in the wishful thinking of the author is his view that "the Bible as a religious text has disappeared from history" (p.120). Following as a natural sequel, and a close second in importance, is his contention that "the Protestant parochial school has collapsed" (p.68). The latter is the logical outcome of the former. The chief reason for Dr. Moehlman's attitude toward the parochial school is his attitude toward the Bible.

The best answer to Dr. Moehlman's denunciation of revealed religion and the educational policies of its adherents is renewed determination to expose the insufficiency of the religion of ethics and fervent prayer for increased zeal in the use of those agencies which teach the eternal Gospel of redemption through the blood of Jesus Christ.

Milwaukee, Wis.

O. C. RUPPRECHT



Sermon Study on 1 John 1:1-4

Eisenach Epistle for the Fourth Sunday in Advent

Like the Letter to the Hebrews, this Epistle is anonymous. Yet there can be no reasonable doubt that the Apostle John, the disciple whom Jesus loved, the author of the Gospel, is also the writer of this letter. The Church Fathers of the early second century ascribe it to him and even a casual reader will be struck by the many allusions to the Gospel of John scattered throughout the letter, and particularly by the similarity of phraseology and style in the prologs to the Gospel and the Epistle. In 1 John 1:1 there is the "beginning" of John 1:1; "looked upon" is the same word translated "beheld," John 1:14; the Logos is the Logos of the Gospel prolog; so also the "Life" of 1 John 1:1, 2. In v. 2 of the Epistle the phrase "with the Father," *πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*, at once calls to our mind the *πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, "with God," of John 1:1, while the "bear witness," "show," "declare," "write," of 1 John 1:2, 3, 4 correspond to the similar expressions of John 1:7, 8, 15. The letter evidently presupposes the Gospel, at least the same author, and the various terms applied to Jesus in the Epistle find their full interpretation and explanation in the Gospel.

In the opening sentence, vv. 1-3, the object is named first, since that was all-important to John. The subject and predicate are stated in v. 3, "we declare," followed by a final clause stating the purpose of the apostolic declaration, and by a definition of the fellowship named in the final clause. V. 2 is a parenthetical statement describing more fully the glorious object which so completely fills the heart and mind of the Apostle. Briefly stated, the Apostle tells his readers, We preach the eternal Son of the Father, whom we have heard and seen and touched, who is Life eternal, and preach Him to you also that you, together with us, might have fellowship with the Father and the Son, and perfect joy.

The Apostle uses the plural, "we." That is not the editorial plural. As editor he uses the singular, cp. 2:1, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14; 5:13. Nor does the plural refer to John and the elders of Ephesus, for the latter had not seen Jesus. John has in mind himself and all the Apostles, who like him had been called to be messengers of Christ to the world and for this purpose were to spend the three years of His ministry in His immediate presence, to be instructed in the Word of Life by Him who was the Word, the Life, and to be witnesses of Him, of His life, His death, His glorious resurrection, Acts 1:21, 22.

Within this select circle there was a smaller group of three: Peter, James, and John, who were still more closely connected with Jesus, who were privileged to accompany Him where even the other

Apostles were not permitted to go. Cp. Mark 5:37; Matt. 17:1; 26:37. And there is reason to believe that of all the Apostles, even of the three, none was closer to Jesus than John, the disciple whom Jesus loved, who leaned on Jesus' bosom, lay on his breast, John 13:23, 25; 19:20; 20:2; 21:7, 20. Yet in his Epistle he speaks not of his own individual conversations and experiences; he speaks of Jesus as He revealed Himself to all Apostles.

The Apostle begins with a neuter pronoun, *ὃ*, that which. Yet there can be no doubt that he has in mind a personal object. All interpretations which suggest some impersonal object, such as the message concerning the Logos or His miracles or His teaching or the mystery of godliness (cp. 1 Tim. 3:16) or the matters designed by God, etc., are refuted by the context. Grammatically *ὃ* need not refer to an impersonal object. It "expresses a collective and comprehensive whole" (*Pulpit Commentary*) and may be used impersonally, John 4:22, or personally, John 6:37; 17:2. Here it is used as Paul uses it of himself, 1 Cor. 15:10, "By the grace of God I am *what I am*," i. e., *that* Paul who, though not worthy to be called an Apostle, yet labored more abundantly than all the other Apostles. The *ὃ* very clearly links together the person and his attributes and his work, all that makes Jesus of Nazareth what He is, the unique God-man, our Redeemer; links together His humanity and deity, His deepest humiliation and His most glorious exaltation; links together with His person such simple, everyday, purely human activities as eating and drinking and such pre-eminently divine miracles as raising the dead and conquering His own death. It is the person of Jesus, our Redeemer, that the Apostle has in mind, the incarnate Word of God, which was with God, which was God, John 1:1, just as John calls Him in his Epistle, "that eternal Life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us," v. 2. Moreover, the statement "our hands have handled" precludes the possibility that "the Word of Life" here is a mere message or that the Apostle has in mind only teachings or miracles, etc., which cannot be touched and handled.

"That which was from the beginning." These opening words recall to every reader the first words of John's Gospel, which, in turn, point back to the majestic words of Gen. 1:1. In the Gospel, John stressed the eternal godhead of the premundane Word that in the course of time was made flesh. In the Epistle he varies the expression without changing the sense. "From the beginning" does not mean to say that the Logos began only at the beginning. No; that which was from the beginning is defined in v. 2 as the eternal Life which was with the Father; hence He certainly *was* from the beginning, since He was before the beginning eternally with the Father. The Apostle's purpose in choosing "from" rather

than "in" may have been "to remove the idea of novelty, which could lessen the dignity of the Gospel" (Athanasius, Calvin, quoted in *Exp. Greek N. T.*).

"That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled." The first pair of verbs are perfects; the second, aorists. "The aorists give the past acts, the perfects the permanent results. Together they sum up the apostolic experiences of that boundless activity of Christ of which the world could not contain the full account" (Plummer, in *Pulpit Commentary*) and, we might add, which were assured, undeniable facts, facts which left a lasting, indelible impression on the minds of the Apostles and exercised a regenerating, thoroughgoing influence on their lives.

The repetitions in the opening verses are due not to loquaciousness, empty redundancy, senile verbosity. They are the sincere effort of an Apostle of the Lord to reassure his readers of the absolute reality of the person of Christ and the trustworthiness of their message concerning Him. We are not preaching a creation of our fancy; our Gospel is not the product of philosophic speculation; our Christ is not a fictitious or legendary character. He is real; we have heard and seen and looked upon and handled Him. We know whereof we speak. We have heard Him speak as no man ever spake; words which healed the sick and ailing, present or far away; words that called the dead back to life. With our own eyes we have seen Him (*ὁράω* is the general term for seeing) perform miracles innumerable and past human understanding, John 21:25. "We have looked upon Him" — *θεάομαι* denotes the intentional, careful, scrutinizing looking at an object to learn its real nature. There is no possibility of mistake on our part. We even handled, felt, touched, Him with our own hands. Each item is sufficient evidence; yet each succeeding statement adds to the certainty, strengthens the assurance, intensifies the conviction, so that the cumulative evidence stands incontrovertibly fast and firm. Cp. 2 Pet. 1:16-18.

Having emphasized the humanity of Christ by the four verbs heard, seen, looked upon, handled, the Apostle goes on to explain more fully the content of the first phrase, "that which was from the beginning." He writes, "of the Word of Life." By employing the prepositional construction, *περί*, concerning, about, of, the Apostle removes all doubt as to the personality of the "Word of Life." Had he simply written, as he might have, "We declare the word of life," there might have been some justification for referring at least this phrase to the word of the Gospel, which is also called the word of life, Phil. 2:16. Such an interpretation is invalidated by the *περί*, about. John speaks in v. 1 not about the Gospel, but concerning Christ, the God-man. And to this Person

he applies the same term which he had used John 1:1-3 of the personal Word of God, whom he had identified with the incarnate Son of God, Jesus Christ, John 1:14.

Just what does this term, "Word," "Logos," applied to Christ only by John, John 1:1-3, 14; 1 John 1:1; Rev. 19:13, mean?

As the thoughts and affections of man's heart are revealed by means of his words, through his speech, so God's thoughts and affections, which no man can know, 1 Cor. 2:7-9, 11, are revealed to us through His word. This revealing word varies greatly as to its nature. It may be a word spoken directly to man, as God spoke to Abraham and other men. It may be the word spoken by men through whom God speaks to mankind. It may be a written word penned by holy men of God as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. It may be that word of God which speaks to man's conscience through that part of His Law still written in his heart. It may be the word spoken through the Angel of the Lord, the Messenger of Jehovah, who is Jehovah Himself, the Second Person in the Trinity, whose word is that of the Father and of Himself, who is One with the Father, through whose word and work and *person* God reveals Himself. In this last case, therefore, we have a revelation of God not merely by words spoken, by deeds performed, but a revelation in and by a person who is Himself the Lord God. This Person it is whom John in the prolog to his Gospel called the Word, the Logos, a Word that was with God. It is a Person distinct from the Father, even as John in our Epistle distinguishes the Father from His Son Jesus Christ, v. 3. Yet the Word, though being the Son, is in no wise inferior to God, to the Father. John tells us that this Word was in the beginning, the uncreated Word; that this Word was not only with God from eternity, in close and intimate union and communion with God, but that it was God and the Creator of the universe, John 1:1-3. In like manner John calls Him in his Epistle, "that which was from the beginning," the Word of Life, the Life, that eternal Life, 1:1-3; the true God and eternal Life, 5:20. There can be no doubt as to the deity of the Word.

John calls the Word "the Word of Life." The genitive τῆς ζωῆς, of Life, is the genitive of apposition and definition, explaining more fully the nature of the Logos; cp. "the breastplate of faith and love, 1 Thess. 5:8; the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Eph. 2:20. Hence "the Word of Life" designates the Word as being Life. In his Gospel, John had called the Logos the Life, John 1:1-4; and Christ says of Himself, "I am the Life," John 11:25; 14:6. Also in this respect He is One with the Father, with whom is the Fountain of Life, Ps. 36:9, who hath life in Himself and hath given to the Son to have life in Himself, John 5:26.

What the Apostles saw was a true human being, found in fashion as a man, Phil. 2:7, 8. What they touched was flesh and bone, as they were bone and flesh. Yet here was more than man. Here was that Person who was from the beginning. Here was the Word that was with God and was God, John 1:1. Here was Life, Life of Life, very God of very God! What an unsearchable mystery! What unfathomable depths do these simple words of John reveal! Human mind cannot grasp, human language cannot adequately describe, this mystery. Even the Apostle, writing by inspiration of God, the Apostle who saw and heard and touched this Word, this Life, can only declare "about" it, περί τοῦ λόγου. "We did not grasp all the wonder, but only its skirts." (Quoted in *Exp. Greek N. T.*, ad loc.)

While penning these words, the thoughts of the Apostle turn back to that blessed time of fellowship with the Word of Life, beginning with that unforgotten and unforgettable tenth hour when John and Andrew had left their former teacher, John the Baptist, followed Him whom their former master had pointed out as the Lamb of God, were invited by Jesus to come to His dwelling place, where they abode with Him that day, John 1:35-40. Unforgotten and unforgettable the days and years he and his fellow Apostles were privileged to hear and see what many Prophets and kings had desired to see and hear and had not heard nor seen, Luke 10:24. Unforgotten the day when He began to teach them what they could not understand, Matt. 16:21, and then six days later took His three close associates to a high mountain and was transfigured before them, Matt. 17:1-8. Unforgettable the day when they saw Jesus weep on the way to the grave of Lazarus, when they saw the tears course down His cheeks, a true man, sympathizing with those that weep, seemingly unable to stay the hand of death, yet speaking marvelous words of comfort to Martha, commanding the stone to be lifted away from the grave. And while all looked at Him with amazement, eagerly observing His every action, they heard His majestic word "Lazarus, come forth!" And Lazarus, the man who had lain in the grave four days, came forth alive! Unforgotten that Passover evening spent with Him in the Upper Room when, lying at Jesus' breast, he felt the heartthrobs of his human Savior; when he partook of the sacred Supper such as only the God-man could institute; when he heard words of instruction and admonition and warning and comfort such as could come only from the lips of Him who came down from heaven, even the Son of Man, which is in heaven; when he listened to that sacerdotal prayer, a prayer such as only He could speak who was One with the Father. Unforgettable those hours of deep humiliation in Gethsemane, where He sobbed forth His prayers for removal of

the cup, of His trial in the palace of the high priest; on Calvary's mount when, hanging on the cross, He gave up His ghost; in Joseph's garden, when His dead body was laid in the grave, followed by the days of joy and jubilation when they saw with their own eyes the risen Conqueror of death, and heard His message of peace, and touched again His living body, and watched Him eat and drink, and received from Him their great commission, and watched Him as He ascended to heaven, from whence, according to His promise, He shall come again to judge the living and the dead and take His own to the eternal home prepared for them by Him. All these scenes flashed back into John's memory as he penned the words "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life." — Ah, they had heard the Word of Life; they had seen the King in His beauty, Is. 33:17; they had intently gazed upon the Lord of glory, 1 Cor. 2:8; they had touched and felt with their own hands Him who is in the bosom of the Father! What fond memories! What blessed people they had been and still were!

And so absorbed is the Apostle in the recollection of the days when he and his fellow Apostles had been with Jesus that he cannot refrain from spending a few moments more in blessed meditation on the beauty and glory of Him who is indeed the Alpha and Omega of his life. In the form of a parenthesis he continues his contemplation.

"And the Life was manifested," that Life which he had just called the Word of Life and of whom he had said that He was in the beginning, that Life was manifested; cp. John 1:14. That mystery of godliness, without controversy the greatest of mysteries, foretold and anxiously awaited by the children of God for four thousand years, at last it had come to pass. The prophecy was fulfilled, the age-long hope and expectation had at last become a reality, a blessed fact. The aorist ἐφανερώθη gathers all the manifestations of Christ, from His incarnation to the day that the Apostle wrote his letter, into one act of glorious manifestation of Life. Christ, the Life of the world, was manifested when the angels announced to the shepherds their good tidings of great joy, Luke 2:8-14. This Life was manifested at the deathbed of Jairus' daughter, at the coffin of the youth of Nain, at the grave of Lazarus. This Life was manifested in the very death of the Prince of Life, for by this death he that had the power of death was destroyed, Heb. 2:14, 15. This Life was manifested in His glorious resurrection, when He who had laid down His life of His own free will took it again by His own power. This Life manifested itself in its life-giving, regenerating power in the hearts of the

Apostles and thousands upon thousands of disciples who had been brought from spiritual death to spiritual life by the power of Jesus, the Life.

All this the Apostles had seen, as John again states : "We have seen." But he now introduces another thought, "We bear witness and show unto you that eternal Life." Having seen the glory of the Only-begotten of the Father, he and his fellow Apostles are bringing the good news to others; cp. Acts 4:20. This bringing the news is called "bearing witness" and "showing." The first term again calls attention to the reliability of the news they bring. It deserves to be called "witness" since it is the unanimous testimony concerning a real Person, the Word of Life, whose reality is testified to by many reliable witnesses who have heard and seen and looked upon and handled Him, v. 1. Cp. 1 Cor. 15:1-8. This witnessing is called a "showing." Ἐπαγγέλλω denotes the voicing forth of news on the part of a messenger. The Apostles were messengers sent forth by the highest authority, by Him who is the Word of Life, the Life, that eternal Life which was with the Father, Matt. 28:18-20; Luke 24:45-48; Acts 1:8. At His command they witness and announce to others that eternal Life which was with the Father. He of whom the Apostle had stated that He was from the beginning, whom he had called "the Word of Life," then "the Life," is now termed "the Life Eternal." And the Apostle adds, "which was with the Father." "With," πρὸς, designates a close, intimate, face-to-face relation; cp. 1 John 2:1 (an Advocate with the Father). It is a suitable word to describe the relation to God the Father of Him who is the Word of God, the Son of God, who is in the bosom of the Father, who is God, One with the Father, in closest, inseparable, loving, essential union. This eternal Life was manifested to us, the Apostles, and Him we witness and proclaim to you. That is the thought carried out in vv. 3 and 4, which at the same time emphasize the twofold purpose of such witnessing and proclamation.

"That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son, Jesus Christ," v. 3. St. John had stressed the personal contact with Jesus to such an extent that his readers might conclude that they could never attain to that fullness of communion with Jesus and of that joy in His presence which had been the privilege of the Apostles. That was not the purpose of the Apostle's message. On the contrary, he had referred to the personal contact only in order to prove the reality of Christ and the trustworthiness of His Gospel of salvation and joy. Continuing the construction of v. 1, he assures them that what the Apostles have seen and heard they now declare to their

readers for the purpose that the readers also may have fellowship with the Apostles.

What kind of fellowship has the Apostle in mind? Not that of the apostolate nor that of hearing Jesus speak and seeing Him with their eyes and touching Him with their hands. True, we hear with the ears of faith the word and voice of Jesus speaking to us through His written Word just as truly and clearly as the Apostles heard His voice speaking to them orally. The method of speaking is different, the voice and word are the same. To this day His sheep hear His Word. It is also true that in this Word we see Jesus, see Him as a child in the manger, see Him in the Temple, see Him baptized in Jordan, follow Him on His journeys, hear Him teaching, watch Him healing, see Him at Lazarus' grave, in the Upper Room, in Gethsemane, on Calvary, see the risen Savior, behold Him ascending to heaven. But the Apostle, while realizing all this, is thinking of a far more glorious fellowship. He says, "And truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ." Our fellowship, that fellowship in which the Apostles stand and into which the readers enter by entering into fellowship with the Apostles, is a fellowship of far greater glory than that of having seen and heard and touched Jesus. Judas did this and was lost forever; the unbelieving Pharisees and Sadducees, many Jews, and not a few Gentiles did this and did not escape damnation. "And, truly," καί . . . δέ; the καί is explanatory and defining, the δέ in connection with καί indicates that something new, unsuspected, surprising, important, is added. Cp. Matt. 10:18; John 6:51; 15:27. The readers did not, like the Apostles, see Jesus; yet by the message of the Apostles concerning this Jesus the readers are being placed, together with the Apostles, as their fellows in faith, into fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ. Truly an altogether new and surprising fact! Fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ. Here the Apostle for the first time calls Him who was from the beginning, who is the Word of Life, the eternal Life with the Father, by that name so familiar and so dear to all believers, "Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father," once more recalling the glory of His person and His work to the mind of his readers. The Son of God is our God-appointed Savior and Redeemer. And with Him and, through Him, with the Father we are in fellowship.

Fellows, friends, children of God, brethren and sisters of our Redeemer! More than that! The Savior had spoken of this fellowship in His farewell words addressed to His disciples and in His sacerdotal prayer, John 14:23; 15:1-8, 26; 16:7, 13, 14; 17:20-26. It is a fellowship of believers with God whereby the Trinity dwells in them and they in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. If God dwells in us and we in Him, surely then God is with us and

then Rom. 8:32-39 applies to us. If God the Father comes to us, together with His Son Jesus Christ, then He comes and fills us with all the fullness of His grace and truth, with forgiveness and righteousness and purity and sanctification and strength and willingness to every good work, with all we need to persevere in faith and hope and love, to reach our journey's goal. If God the Father and the Son dwell in us in intimate fellowship, will they not keep their dwelling place clean and pure? Will not the Son cleanse our hearts from our daily sins by His divine Gospel, the Father forgive our sins and remember them no more, the Holy Spirit daily assure us of these blessed facts and keep us in true faith?

And we in God! What enemy, no matter how powerful and cunning he may be, can harm us if God, our loving Father, and Jesus Christ, our merciful Savior, and the Holy Spirit, our ever present Comforter, is the triple-walled fortress, the impregnable tower, to which we can flee, yes, in which we dwell and live and move and have our being? And while fellowship with the Son of God, Jesus Christ, is naturally a fellowship with Him in suffering, it is, thank God, a fellowship with Him also in His resurrection and glorification, Rom. 8:17; Phil. 3:10; John 17:24.

"And these things write we unto you that your joy may be full," v. 4. John again speaks in the plural. He was not the only one engaged in writing "these things." There was Paul, and Peter, and James, and Jude, and Matthew, and Mark, and Luke, all writing "these things," the message of salvation in Christ Jesus. The Apostle places these writings on the same level with the apostolic preaching, and the terms used before: "bear witness," "declare," "show," include also the Gospels and Epistles written by inspiration of God. The purpose of these writings as well as of their preaching was the perfection of the joy of the readers and hearers of their word.

"May be full," ἢ πεπληρωμένη. The perfect participle connected with εἰμί emphasizes the "completion, intensity, overwhelming finality," of the root idea, as Gildersleeve, quoted by Robertson in his *Grammar*, p. 907, puts it. The most glorious, most complete and perfect joy of which the human heart is capable in this life is that of a Christian in his Savior and, through Jesus, in his God. That is a God-given, divinely created joy, the Lord Himself supplying the foundation on which it rests and creating this joy in the heart of His child. This joy lives not on uncertainties, on human hopes, on fleeting, vanishing things, only to die and be superseded by weeping and despairing sorrow. No; the Christian's joy lives on eternal realities, on everlasting verities, on God, the Creator and Ruler of the universe, on Jesus Christ, through whom this Ruler has become the believer's reconciled, loving Father. It rests on the

assurance of God's grace, on the certainty of the forgiveness of our sin, on the unwavering sureness of everlasting life — all blessings procured by Him who is Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Word of Life. To make this joy the sun illuminating the path of every believer, to make this joy of the child of God on earth more and more conformable to the fullness of perfection of the joy in heaven, that is the purpose of John's speaking and writing. The preaching of the Word of Life is a power of God to gladden the heart of the Christian in the midst of the sorrows of this world. Reading the Bible, His Word, the Christians learn to know and love Him. There they see the manger and the cross and the empty tomb. There they accompany Him on His life's journey and learn to cherish Him as their Friend, their King, their God, their Redeemer, their one and all, of whom they confess, "For me to live is Christ." Thanks be to God for His unspeakable gift!

We celebrate the birthday anniversaries of men who have rendered outstanding services to their country. This coming week the nativity of a man born 1944 years ago will be celebrated throughout the world, within and without Christendom. Though His name is universally known, He Himself and His life's purpose are little known, John 1:10, 11. Many volumes have been written on the question, Who is the real Jesus? In our Epistle we meet a man who knew Jesus by personal contact, by intimate association with Him during the three years of Jesus' public ministry. He writes not on the basis of hearsay; he does not state his own theories; he simply writes what he and others with Him saw and heard and knew to be facts, irrefutable realities concerning the life and work of their Jesus of Nazareth. In answer to the question, *Who Is This Jesus of Nazareth?* he answers: He is the Godhead veiled in flesh, vv. 1 and 2; He is the Author of our fellowship with God, v. 3; He is the Source of everlasting joy, v. 4. — Another suggested theme: *Christmas Day, the Birthday of Mysteries* — the birth of a mysterious person, vv. 1 and 2; of a mysterious fellowship, v. 3; of a mysterious joy, v. 4. The Apostle stresses the message, oral and written, of the Gospel. Hence: *Let Us Gladly Hear and Read God's Word* — for the strengthening of our faith; for the maintenance of our fellowship with God; for the increase of our joy. Or: *Let Us Bring the Christmas Gospel to a Dying World*. Here we have irrefutable truth in a world of fraud and lying; here we have fellowship with God in a world of disunion; here we have fullness of joy in a world of sorrow.

TH. LAETSCH

Outlines on Gospels Adopted by Synodical Conference

Third Sunday in Advent

Matt. 3:1-12

John was an unusual person: prophesied about in the Old Testament, clad in the garb of Elijah, eating the simplest food, carrying on his work in the wilderness and along the Jordan. He was a great Advent preacher. We need His message today. He speaks of

The Reception We Are to Give to Christ

1. *There must be no carnal pride of nationality or race*
2. *We must see that mere outward religiousness will not suffice*
3. *There must be heart repentance*
4. *There must be recognition of Jesus' coming in the Word and the Sacraments*

1

Mere descent from Abraham did not avail, v. 9. Some people boast of being Americans, as if their citizenship in our country made them children of God. We should love our United States, but woe to those who fasten their hopes of heaven to such external matters. Our Lutheranism is a precious heritage. How sad if it is to us merely something inherited!

2

Witness John's castigation of the Pharisees and Sadducees. The Pharisees displayed great religious zeal. The Sadducees, the priestly party, were likewise strict in their adherence to the rules concerning the sacrifices. We see from Matthew 23 that with the Pharisees, generally speaking, the religious fervor concerned itself with the shell, and not with the kernel. The same thing we see with respect to the Sadducees (the high priests) at the trial of Jesus. — How often we are satisfied with the external acts of religion and with outward church connection!

3

Repent, says John, v. 2. He speaks of sin and God's wrath, v. 10, but likewise of grace, v. 2. Repentance signifies recognition of our sinfulness, our need of help, furthermore, true sorrow with respect to our wrongdoing, and, finally, the acceptance of forgiveness earned by the Savior and offered by God's grace. If this repentance is sincere, good works will follow spontaneously.

4

John preached, and the people thronged about him to receive his message. He likewise baptized, and many accepted his baptism.

Thus Jesus comes today. It seems a humble, insignificant advent. But in these simple means of grace dwells the Holy Spirit, v. 11. —

Let us meet Jesus as He approaches us again and again in the Word and the Sacraments and thus escape the fire of the judgment, v. 12.

W. ARNDT

Fourth Sunday in Advent

Mark 6:17-29

Vanity, all is vanity! Who would dare to write this as a caption under all the Christmas preparations reaching their climax today? But while we are standing at the very threshold of Christmas, our text, as an Advent text, stands guard at the entrance to the great festival urging: Beware, lest it all be vanity! This text presents a story of people to whom the message, "Behold, He comes!" was in vain.

Why Some People Receive No Blessing from the Message of Christ's Coming

1. *This is not because God does not offer His blessing to them, but*
2. *Because they mean to continue in their sin, and*
3. *Because they are too proud to heed the voice of their conscience*

1

The characters of this text, although utterly unworthy, had heard about Christ, chiefly through the Forerunner. Herod "heard of Him" (Mark 6:14), knew of His "mighty works." Even after this royal adulterer had yielded to the nagging of the equally adulterous Herodias and had cast John into prison, this king still had the hand of God reaching out after his soul: Herod "heard him gladly." Herodias, cruel and revengeful, had heard that correcting accusation, "It is not lawful," as a warning. That notorious family of Herod, placed right in the midst of the time and place where Christ accomplished the world's salvation! Truly, God would have all men to be saved!

God seeks to save that which was lost. This is impressed upon us in this Christmas season: "Good tidings which shall be to *all* people." Familiar truth to us, but a truth impressively demonstrated to us at each Christmas time. The message goes out in so many forms. The children study the story of the Christ Child; God is using the air waves to bring the message in so many radio programs; the carol singing, the best music of the season, the Christmas services — all help to bring God's message also to the Herods and the Herodias and the Salomes: "Come unto Me!" God planned this Christmas blessing for all.

2

This family of Herod, however, hears this message of a Savior come into the world without any blessing.

Herodias had a life story. Having flitted about a corrupt and licentious imperial court at Rome, she imbibed its spirit. Married to one Herod, she consorts with another Herod, already married; adulterous and incestuous. She hears that a preacher has dared criticize her actions, a preacher who had also spoken about a Lamb of God taking away sin. Result: Herodias "has a quarrel" against John (literally: "has it in for him"); she would have killed him. To gain her point, she does not hesitate to make her own dancing daughter an accomplice in the murder. She will have her adulterous life, preacher or no preacher. She loves her pet sin, hence, no blessing for her in Christ's coming.

On the threshold of Christmas, many reject its blessings for the same reason. Indeed, anyone can get that shallow thrill of Christmas which comes from expensive gifts, enjoyable social affairs, well-filled cash registers, and rising graphs of business activity. But only penitent sinners can get the real Christmas blessing. The cheat who plans to cheat some more, the thief who plans to continue his thievery, the slanderer who plans to continue his slandering, the despiser of Word and Sacrament who plans to continue his way, will find that for him Christmas will bring nothing more than the anticlimactic feeling of being glad when it is all over with.

3

Herod is an example of a man torn by conflicting emotions. He is torn this way and that; his conscience tells him to do one thing, his pride drags him away in the opposite direction.

Herod's conscience was not yet completely dead: He thinks that Jesus is John the Baptist risen from the dead (v. 16); he believes John is "a just man and an holy," and he "feared" John (v. 20); he even protected him from the wiles of Herodias ("observed him" = "guarded" him); he heard John gladly, and upon the horrid request of the girl he was "exceedingly sorry."

Why, then, did he not listen to the voice of his conscience and accept the word of John? Pride was the motive for overriding his conscience. "For his oath's sake." A king breaking an oath made to an appealing and clever girl! "For their sakes which sat with him." A king exposing himself to the contemptuous sneers of his inferiors! Impossible! Herod must choose between what is right and what is saving his face. He does the latter and silences that voice which would have brought him further blessings.

So do people greet the message of Christmas and lose its blessing. They know that they have led sinful lives, have con-

stantly stifled the voice of their conscience. Christmas comes to them with a Savior from *sin*; but their pride denies sin; to them sin is only a few mistakes which everybody makes. Such people feel that they are still far better than others whom they could name. Such are satisfied with the outward thrills and frills of the festival, too sure of themselves to acknowledge that Christ came because of sin. Hence, "Unto you is born a Savior" leaves them cold.

May this Christmas not be vanity of vanities to us! Let it be a Christmas in which Christ the Savior is all! H. O. A. KEINATH

Christmas Day

Matt. 1:18-25

"Oh, sing unto the Lord a new song, for He hath done marvelous things!" Ps. 98, 1. How fittingly these words of the Christmas Introit strike the keynote of this festive day! To all the seven seas, to every battlefield, wherever are assembled the sons and daughters of our nation, there goes, by way of radio, through sermon and story and song, the nineteen-century-old message of Christmas. In almost every language, to the very ends of all the earth, there sounds out the joyous story of Christ's birth. Thus is fulfilled the prophecy of the Christmas angel (Luke 2:10), "Behold, I bring you good tidings . . . which shall be to *all people*." How wonderful! But even more wonderful is the birth of Christ itself. Hence —

The Marvelous Birth of Jesus

1. It is a "*marvelous thing*" because it is the birth of God.

A. "He was conceived by the Holy Ghost," vv. 18, 23. His mother — a virgin, as prophesied Is. 7:14; stated in our text, vv. 18, 25; attested by an angel, v. 20; and acknowledged by the one most intimately related and most deeply concerned, vv. 24, 25.

B. He is called God, v. 23 (Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός, lit., "With us God"); אֱלֹהִים in v. 23 (cp. Is. 7:14: Immanuel); and in v. 21 (Ἰησοῦς, from the Hebrew יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, lit., perhaps, "Jah is Salvation"). These names, God and Jehovah, are Old Testament designations for the one true God. See also Luke 1:16 and v. 76, where "Lord" is equivalent to Jehovah. (Is. 40:3; Luke 2:11; Matt. 2:4-11.)

The birth of Jesus is the birth of God, hence worshiping and serving Him ought to be the most important phase of our Christmas celebration and of our entire life. But is it? Verily, the pleasures, the cares, and the worries of this evil world continually crowd Him out — even out of our homes and out of our lives! Indeed, "we daily sin much and indeed deserve nothing but punishment." And yet there is hope — in the birth of Jesus, for —

2. It is a "marvelous thing" because it is the birth of our Savior.

A. "He shall save" not merely from sinning, but, v. 21, "from their sins," all of them! Truly, a comforting truth, making our salvation dependent not on us, but on Christ. (See also Luke 1:47, 68, 71-74; 2:11.) He saved us by removing the curse of the Law, Gal. 3:13; fulfilling it in our stead, Gal. 4:4, 5; not imputing our trespasses to us, 2 Cor. 5:19; Rom. 4:5, 7, 8, 22-25.

B. He saved *all* mankind, Luke 2:10, 32; John 1:29; from all sin, 1 John 1:7; but only those who accept Him as their Savior become "His people," v. 21; Gal. 3:7-11, 26; 4:4, 5.

C. He is the *only* Savior, v. 21 (emphatic, lit., "He and none other"); Is. 43:11; John 14:6; Acts 4:12; 1 John 5:12; 2 John 9.

How very gracious of God thus to be conceived of a sinful woman; born as a babe; laid in a manger; nourished like an infant — in order that through His sacrifice we might be saved. Should not we in the face of such humiliation and such an offering on our behalf be truly humble and eternally grateful? To this end let us like the shepherds of old return to our daily tasks, "glorifying and praising God for all the things which we have seen and heard," that others, too, may through our efforts hear of this Christ, believe in Him and be saved.

Surely, the Lord "hath done marvelous things." May we, therefore, on this happy day of Christmas "sing unto Him a new song," not merely with our lips, but with our hearts and lives.

THEO. F. NICKEL

Sunday after Christmas

Luke 2:22-32

Christmas and its joyous services are a thing of the past. Within a few hours we shall close another year. War still rages and many hearts are full of fear for the future.

This is not the Christian attitude to assume. From our text we may learn much on this last Sunday of the year as we consider

Facing the Future Unafraid with Christ

1. How Simeon did this
2. How we may do this

1

A. Our text is a post-Christmas text. V. 21 refers to the circumcision of Christ. V. 22 refers to the presentation of Jesus, Lev. 12:1. The text is well suited to serve as a post-Christmas text. It is definitely suited as a pre-New Year text because it illustrates the firm and wonderful faith of Simeon.

B. Vv. 22-24 explain to us how the Baby Jesus came to the Temple, where Simeon could see Him. According to the Law of Moses (Ex. 13:12) the first-born child really belonged to God and

had to be presented to Him as His own property. Since in later years the Levites were substituted for the first-born of every family in Israel to do the service of the Tabernacle, the first-born children were redeemed. (Ex. 13:15; Num. 18:6.)

C. Simeon was a faithful Christian. Fine description, v. 25. Because he had faith in the coming of the Messiah, God looked upon him as just and declared him to be righteous. He was devout and demonstrated his Christianity in his regular life. The Holy Spirit was definitely with him, v. 25 c. The Holy Spirit had not only by special revelation assured him that he would not die before he had seen Christ (v.26), but this same Spirit led him to the Temple at the very time when Mary and Joseph presented Jesus to the Lord, v. 27.

D. His faith in God, a faith made strong by actually seeing the long-awaited Redeemer, brought real joy to the heart of Simeon and caused him to be able to face the future without fear. We see this demonstrated in his song of praise (vv. 29-32), in which he praised God for His goodness to him personally and to the whole world. He now had seen his Lord, and he knew by personal experience that the Savior had come and that he was at peace with God and reconciled unto His Maker through the Savior, v. 29. Having attained his highest ambition in life — to see his Salvation with his own eyes, the Lord Jesus, v. 30 — he faced the future unafraid. Nothing could harm him. Even death was nothing to fear, because in Christ he was at peace with God.

E. Simeon also knew that the future, the future of all nations, the salvation of the world, was in the hands of the Redeemer-King, vv. 31, 32. Simeon's words re-echo Is. 9:2; 60:1-3. Simeon could well trust his own future and the future of the world to such a wonderful Savior and face the future unafraid. We may do the same thing.

2

A. We may face the future unafraid on this last Sunday of 1944 if we follow in the footsteps of Simeon, of Mary and Joseph. In order to rid ourselves of worry and care, trouble and stress, let us go to church. Show how churchgoing, the use of the Word and Sacrament, will drive away fear and care and give hope and cheer.

B. We can face the future unafraid if like Simeon we permit the Spirit to teach us, to lead us, to guide us, vv. 26a, 27a. The Spirit will lead us unto the truth and will show us that in God and in Christ we have everything we actually need. John 14:26, 27.

C. We may face the future unafraid if with Simeon we rejoice in Christ. We cannot take the physical Christ into our arms, as Simeon did, but we know that Christ is truly with us, Matt. 28:20 b. Our soldiers and sailors have learned to face the foe, and also the

future, unafraid in the knowledge that the ever-present Christ is with them.

D. Christians may face the future unafraid also because of the knowledge of His salvation for all people. God's purposes will be accomplished also in the days of war. Even these days of war serve the purpose of spreading the Gospel all over the world. (Mention missionary experiences of soldiers and sailors.) For such a wonderful Savior, whose plans for the world of the future and the future salvation are being carried out give praise. On Him cast all your cares as the new year dawns. E. L. ROSCHKE

New Year's Eve

Is. 30:18-21

Another year of our life here upon this earth has passed away. What a year it has been! We are living in a world that has been and still is in great distress. War, bloodshed, destruction: God's judgment upon a sinful world. We are living in a world that lieth in great wickedness. And how about ourselves? What about our life during the last twelve months? What has been our relation to God?

Of What Should We be Reminded as This Year Draws to a Close?

1. *Of our people's sins and of our own*
2. *Of God's great mercy and grace*

1

a. The sins of our people. When attacked by their enemies, the Israelites turned to man for help and not unto God, vv. 1, 2; 31:3; the Lord's Word they despised, 30:9-11. They were a rebellious people, v. 9; brought adversity and affliction upon themselves, v. 20; and indeed had cause to weep, v. 19.

This war is God's judgment upon a sinful world, also upon our nation, calling men to repentance. But our nation has not been brought to its knees. Our people rather trust in their own power and that of their allies, instead of seeking help from God. The Word of the Lord is despised. The Lord's prophets are told to speak smooth things, vv. 10, 11. In the meantime sinful living goes on. Considering all the misery that is in the world, this night surely ought not to be a night for carousing and merry-making, but rather a night in which our people get down on their knees and humble themselves before God. But do they?

b. Our own sins. God's judgment is also upon us, 1 Pet. 4:17, 18. How have we reacted? Are we aware of our sins, our many transgressions of God's holy Word? Has the line of demarcation between us and the people of the world been closely drawn, or have we at times sinned together with the world? Have we always

been conscious of our obligation to a sinful world, to wit, to let our light shine, Matt. 5:14, and to hold forth the Word of Life, Phil. 2:15, 16? Have we been thankful for the treasure of God's Word? Have we gladly heard it? Did we read it in our homes?

Will the Lord still show mercy to us and our people? Thank God, yes.

2

a. The Lord delays not only His final judgment but also His most severe and widespread judgments now; He is merciful and gracious, not willing that any should perish, vv. 18, 19; Ezek. 18:31, 32.

The Lord has not been very severe in His punishment upon our people. Compared with other war-stricken countries, we have been spared very much by the Lord. True, many of our sons and some of our daughters have had to go to war. Some will never return, others as cripples. But at home we hardly know that there is a war. We are still enjoying the comforts of life, have enough food to eat, have much money, and can lie down to sleep at night without fear that our cities and homes will be destroyed. We still have the Word of God, can read it in our homes and hear it in our churches. But our nation as a nation even despises God's long-suffering mercy. Not only have our people at large continued in the life of sin as before, but sin and crimes have increased, youth delinquency, immorality, etc. There has been no run on the churches in the past year. How many of the people of our country will be found in the churches in this night or on New Year's Day? Yes, how many of our own people will be missing either tonight or tomorrow morning?

b. Yet God is waiting, v. 18; He is long-suffering, merciful, and gracious, vv. 18, 19; His Word is still with us, vv. 20, 21. And we have the promise that if we cry to Him, confessing our sins, He will be very gracious and hear us.

God's mercy and grace is our comfort and encouragement. Let us not despise it. Let us turn to God anew. We need not take any of the sins of the old year with us into the new. If we but acknowledge our sins and repent and accept God's forgiveness in Christ, our Savior, we are God's dear children, 1 John 1:7. God's blessings will remain with us. If truly penitent, we must, of course, forsake our sins and in our life bring forth the fruits of the Spirit, Gal. 5:22-24. Finally, we should not forget our obligation to the world to bring unto many everywhere the Word of Life.

Let us prayerfully and in true humility close this old year. Relying upon God's grace, let us confidently and cheerfully enter upon the new year. As God's children, let us cast our many cares upon Him, knowing that He cares for us, 1 Pet. 5:7. Then, truly, we shall enjoy a blessed and happy new year.

J. H. C. FRITZ

New Year's Day

Luke 13:1-9

There seems to be little connection between the Standard Gospel and our text. Yet in the center of both is Jesus, the Mediator between God and man. In Luke 2:21 Jesus is shown presenting to God the first drops of His holy, innocent blood as the initial payment on the ransom price which forms the basis of His intercession. He is also shown teaching us the immensity of our guilt, which only the blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, could cancel. These two phases of Christ's mediatorship, so necessary for man's salvation, are clearly brought out in the text which we have chosen for today. For our instruction, admonition, and comfort let us on this first day of the new year turn our attention to

Jesus Revealing Himself as Our Mediator

1. *Speaking to us for God, He proclaims to us God's call to repentance*
2. *Speaking to God for us, He pleads our cause before God's judgment throne*

1

A. The stories vv. 1 and 4a both tell of swift, sudden death: in the one case due to the brutality of man, in the other to accident. In the history of death's universal rule over mankind the year 1944 will go down as one in which death has reaped one of the most horrible harvests throughout the world. At home and abroad how many thousands of lives have been snuffed out by accidents, unavoidable or due to carelessness! And how many thousands and tens of thousands has the grim reaper cut down in battle by bombing, torpedoing, conflagration, starvation, owing to the brutality and hatred of men!

B. Jesus' answer, vv. 2-5, teaches us the folly and sinfulness of those who have been spared a like fate and on that account in self-righteous self-satisfaction regard themselves as better than those stricken down. Jesus assures His countrymen that all Galileans and all inhabitants of Jerusalem had deserved a similar fate as those so suddenly cut off. The lesson for us: All Americans, all inhabitants of every country and city, also we, have deserved God's judgment; and, unless we repent, we, like them, shall perish. Let us look back at the year 1944 and at our record before God's judgment throne. The pastor will point out sins prevailing in his congregation, sins of commission and of omission, and on the basis of Scripture drive home man's depravity, Ps. 51:5; Is. 64:6; Rom. 7:18; etc., and God's appalling, all-consuming wrath against sin and the sinner, Deut. 32:20-22; Ps. 5:4-6; Rom. 1:18; 2:8, 9. These truths

must be preached to our generation and to our people lest we forget the hopelessness of our cause if we had only our own works to rely upon, Rom. 3:19, 20, 23. Thank God, that is not the only side to Christ's Mediatorship.

2

A. In close connection with the incidents narrated in vv. 1-5 Jesus spoke the parable of the unfruitful fig tree, picturing Himself as our Mediator pleading for us that we might be granted another year of grace.

B. A Lutheran congregation, above others, is like a fig tree planted in the rich soil of a vineyard. By the grace of God we enjoy in full the riches of God's pure Gospel; we have the Sacraments, the open Bible, day school and Sunday school, vast Lutheran literature, our church periodicals, pastor and schoolteacher, etc. All these blessings are bestowed upon us by our gracious God for a purpose, and this purpose He Himself states very clearly: "I come seeking fruit on this fig tree," v. 7, fruit of the spirit as Paul describes it. We have seen what our record was. What excuse can we offer if in spite of the superabundant grace of God we have brought so little fruit, and fruit so very far below the standard that God has laid down in His holy Law? God has a right to look for fruit in special abundance from people so especially favored. Could we charge God with injustice if He should decide to cut us down as unfruitful trees which only cumber the ground or as trees which do not bear the amount of fruit that He has a right to expect? What would become of us if on this first day He should announce this decision to us?

C. Behold Jesus pleading for us! Like the gardener pleading for another year of grace for the unfruitful fig tree, vv. 8, 9, so Christ, who on the eighth day after His birth shed the first drops of His blood for our redemption, pleads to this day with God for His negligent and careless Christian, asking God, "Grant him another year of grace; grant Me one more opportunity to bring My message of redemption and salvation to him in order to turn him from his evil way." Yes, the Lord is gracious and will for the sake of His Son give us another opportunity to show our gratitude for His abundant blessings by bringing forth fruit. He will continue among us with His Word and Sacrament, the means of grace, of regeneration, of justification, sanctification, and preservation. Let us use them diligently: let us from the Law recognize ever better the wickedness of our sin, Lam. 3:40; Ps. 90:5-8, and with sorrowing, repentant hearts let us, like Israel of old, turn to the Lord for forgiveness, Jer. 3:22; Joel 2:12, 13; let us make this new year a year of loyalty to our Savior, a year of bringing forth fruit a hundredfold.

THEO. LAETSCH

Theological Observer

The Excellency of Dr. Dau's Work.—In view of the fact that, alas! only too soon, even the outstanding benefactors of mankind are forgotten after their departure, it may be well for us to consider the remarks which Dr. H. Hamann, editor of the *Australasian Theological Review* (April—June, 1944), briefly makes concerning the value of Dr. W. H. T. Dau's work for his Church. After describing his *vita* and literary productions, Dr. Hamann writes: "The greatest excellency of Dau's work is what we have come to accept as matter of course in all our theological teachers and leaders: orthodoxy, teaching that is soundly Scriptural and Lutheran. We shall speak of but one other quality which always seemed to us outstanding. More than most other teachers and writers of similar caliber, Dr. Dau was gifted with a sense of form. We do not know whether at a later date he changed his methods of academic work, but those students who were at St. Louis when he made his appearance must remember the impression made by his lectures on dogmatics with their stately diction and fine flow of language. I do not recall anything like it from my student notes. That appeal to form was especially noticeable in his printed sermons. They might have been slightly 'over the head' of some congregations, had they been delivered before the average body of worshipers; but they amply repay the most careful reading and study on the part of the pastor who would improve the construction and the style of his sermons. Not only did Dr. Dau know how to get the most out of his text and to present these thoughts in a new, striking, and fascinating manner, but the marshaling of thoughts, the varied appeal to intellect, feeling, and will, together with the use of language that was literary even when it was simple, and that was frequently brilliant and picturesque: all these features combined to make the sermon beautiful as well as truly edifying. It was not necessary for the author to sign his customary D; he always stamped the sermon with an originality and individuality that proclaimed it unmistakably his. Other writings of Dau, too, had this quality of unforgettability, if one may use this noun. It must be more than thirty years since there was printed in a synodical report—of the Nebraska District, I believe—an essay by Dr. Dau on the parables of Jesus contained in the thirteenth chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew. Yet the impression made by the masterly handling of the subject has not faded from the mind, while in a practical sense the reading yielded valuable suggestions and material for a number of sermons. In short, Dr. Dau was a teacher from whom one would gladly learn, and whose manner of teaching one longed to perpetuate."

J. T. M.

Vengeance.—All over the country people anticipating victory are discussing peace terms for Germany and Japan. The CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is altogether incompetent to offer worth-while opinions or suggestions on conditions of peace from the point of view of the statesman. It is not a political journal, nor have its editors received any

training in statesmanship. It would be foolish for us to try to solve the problems which will confront our statesmen when the fighting has ceased. But whatever message the Word of God has for us in this crisis, our journal is duty bound to set forth to the best of its ability. One principle the Word of God definitely tells all believers in Jesus is, that in their conduct they must not be actuated by motives of vengeance. "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you." Vengeance is a disposition which Christians should not cultivate. The Father in heaven forgives, His children should do likewise. This has its direct bearing on the discussions which now are in progress, because our Christians are citizens of this country and as such, under our democratic system, share in the tasks and responsibilities of the Government. No Christian citizen, when he votes at the polls or when he addresses a meeting where views on the peace terms are presented or when he writes articles for newspapers and in them surveys the postwar problems, can consistently be actuated by feelings of hate and the desire to retaliate. That is something the Church must tell its members. In doing so, it is not entering the field of politics, but merely preaching the Word in timely fashion. Certainly no one will care to advance the thesis that in his private life the Christian must abstain from hatred, but in his public life, when he acts as a member of the body politic, he may entertain feelings of vengeance. Whether in the approaching negotiations and developments the Christians who suppress the tendency to practice retaliation against enemies will prevail, may well be doubted; but this must not keep them from taking the course which the Word of God and their conscience plainly indicate. A.

An Attack on the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.—With amazement we read an article in the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* of October, 1944, written by Dr. C. B. Gohdes, professor of history in Capital University, Columbus, Ohio, in which a direct attack is made on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as taught, f. i., in the seventh article of the Formula of Concord. The article has the caption "A Review of the Traditional Lutheran Position on the Lord's Supper." We hope that at some time in the not distant future an article can appear in this journal in which the position taken by Dr. Gohdes will be thoroughly examined. The present lines are designed merely to take note of the appearance of the attack and briefly to describe its nature.

Dr. Gohdes, it is true, avows loyalty to the Confessions. "The writer accepts with all his heart the plan of salvation as laid down in the Confessions, inclusive of the dogma of the Real Presence" (p. 341). But he does not hesitate to criticize. To begin with, the terminology of the Confessions on this point is unsatisfactory. It is time to examine it (p. 344). The exegesis, presented in the Formula of Concord, of 1 Cor. 10:16, moreover, is not tenable, he believes. Then there follows an examination of the Holy Supper "in its Scriptural setting." In the midst of this discussion he states his own view on the Real Presence: "The reception of [Jesus] Himself with the blessings He wrought for us when His body was broken in death for us, when His blood was shed for us, when

thus His life was given as a ransom for many: that is the real presence which does not require the mystifying, mind-baffling theological speculation of *Christ's real, essential body and blood being received with the mouth*" (italics by the author).

It is not necessary that we quote any more passages. The final section, entitled "Why a More Liberal Exposition of the Communion Dogma?" confirms that Dr. Gohdes rejects the Lutheran teaching of an oral, though supernatural, eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood. It is sad that he joins the large group of European Lutheran theological leaders who have turned their backs on the position of Luther and the Lutheran Confessions. We hope his brethren will show him that his stand means not merely a defection from a time-honored position, but from the Scriptures. A.

Christian Education.—*The Presbyterian Guardian* (Oct. 10, 1944) under this heading writes editorially: "The education of our children is a matter of supreme importance. The thinking of these children will affect the world in years to come. Too often we have been content with ignorance as to what the boys and girls were being taught in the schools. When they had homework problems and asked us a question or two, we answered as best we could. Our religious thinking colored their lives in the way in which it all too frequently colors our own—pretty much at the periphery of things. And as a result, when they grew up, their thinking was not in terms of a Christian view of things, but of a naturalistic or worldly view of things. We hold that the Scriptures are the only rule of both faith and life—of what we are to believe and of the duty God requires of us. But how capable are we—even we who have more or less completed our formal education—of stating in plain terms their implications for politics, business, social questions, and other matters of daily life? A visit to a general assembly of our church would quickly suggest that we do not yet know all the answers. It is indeed no simple matter to apply the principle of Scripture as the rule of faith and life. The first need of all, then, is to form the habit of thinking in terms of the teachings of Scripture. A habit is not acquired suddenly. The very word suggests that which results from frequent and continued repetition. Habits of thinking must be acquired early in life. That is one of the chief points in a Christian elementary training. It is quite true that the letters of the alphabet and the sums of arithmetic are the same—in a formal sense—for Christians and non-Christians. But the basis upon which they and all other contents of our system of knowledge rest is radically different for the Christian from what it is for the non-Christian. As Christians we should be in the habit of seeing the life we live and the thoughts we think in terms of the more ultimate foundations and relationships. Now, if we are to acquire the habit of thinking in terms of Scripture teaching, a beginning must be made in the elementary educational program. That is why Christian day schools, even for children just beginning school, are so important. In these schools even the learning of the three R's does not introduce the children to a habit of thought that is outside the Christian framework. A habit is formed which carries through higher education and through life the habit of relating all aspects of our life to the Christian system of truth,

which alone is the truth." The editorial is written as a plea for more Christian school societies, which in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church support the Christian day schools. We who regard the maintenance of Christian day schools as a duty of the congregation hail such editorials with real joy, for they show us how very right and pedagogically sound our principle is of having Christian schools in which not only the Christian doctrine is taught in theory, but also habits of Christian living are formed by constant application of Scripture as a rule of life. Sometimes it is well for us to be reminded by others of the greatness of the blessing of the Christian day school, which as a Church we enjoy by God's grace.

J. T. M.

The Danger and Evil of Cynicism.—The editor of the *Christian Century* (issue of September 27, 1944), using the caption "Democracy with a Sneeer," speaks of cynicism as an evil that is attacking the vitals of our country. First he points out that in France cynicism was rampant before 1940, and he thinks that this cynicism was responsible for the debacle of that year. What he has in mind is best brought out in this paragraph: "Edgar Ansel Mowrer, the distinguished American correspondent, tells of overhearing two Frenchmen in excited debate during the Paris riots in 1934, while one tried to persuade the other to join the mob's attack on the Chamber of Deputies. At last, in despair, he threw his arms in the air and shouted, 'What holds you back? You admit that these fellows in the Chamber are all scoundrels. Why won't you join us to sweep them out?' Whereupon the other replied, 'Because we are scoundrels, too!'" In speaking of our own country the editor says, "The spirit of cynicism is spreading everywhere in American life. Here also growing numbers believe that politics, the press, the schools, the professions, the labor unions, the commercial interests, and even parts of the Church are so tainted with self-interest and banality that none of our leaders deserve to be trusted and few to be followed. Moralists deplore what they call the growth of sophistication among Americans. What they really mean is the cynicism which is eating away, termite-fashion, the pillars of the republic. . . . Never in our memory has it been so widely taken for granted that both the principal candidates for the nation's leadership will speak, endorse positions, and in other ways make commitments without compunction as to their true beliefs or intentions, but solely with a view to cajoling votes at the ballot box in November. . . . That threadbare wisecrack of American politics tells the story: 'A party platform is like a railway car platform—something to get in on, not to ride on.'"

We, too, are afraid of this cynicism. The charge is not unwarranted that it is affecting some sections of the Church. It is dreadful if large numbers of the church members think that pastors, teachers, and leaders are actuated by motives of self-interest and not by the principles of the religion which they profess. Still more sad, of course, would be the case if this pessimistic view were based not merely on suspicion, but on fact. Dr. Walther certainly knew what he was doing when in the last months of his life he repeatedly prayed: "Gott erhalte uns ein frommes Ministerium!"

A.

Rome's Annulment of Marriages.—*America* (Roman Catholic weekly) complains that a "hardy perennial" which refuses to be destroyed is the charge put in these words, "The Catholic Church does not allow divorce. She merely grants an *annulment*. It's the same thing with a different label." *America* criticizes this view and says, "A civil divorce presupposes that the marriage is valid and claims to break the bonds which unite husband and wife. The Church declares that these bonds are unbreakable. A decree of nullity declares that the marriage never was valid and that there is no bond to break. It was a statement that there was some flaw in the marriage contract which rendered it null and void from the beginning. If it had been valid, the bond could not be broken except by the death of one of the parties." It is true that there is a difference between an annulment and a divorce. Our Lutheran Church, too, holds that some marriages have to be annulled because they were illegal to begin with, for instance, incestuous unions. It is true, too, that the number of annulments granted during the past year by the Roman *Rota* was not large—39. Our complaint is that the Roman Catholic Church fails to recognize that according to the Scriptures a divorce is permissible if one of the parties has become guilty of adultery or if malicious desertion has occurred. It is in flouting the plain teachings of Scripture that Rome manifests the spirit of Antichrist.

A.

The Pope Is the Antichrist.—The antichristian character of the Papacy is very evident in the new profession required of converts to Catholicism. In it the doctrinal position of Trent with its anathema of justification by faith and the papal arrogance officially sanctioned by the Vatican Council are openly taught. The following is taken from the July, 1942, issue of *Emmanuel*, a monthly magazine published by The Fathers of the Blessed Sacrament, 184 E. 76th St., New York City:

"The following official translation of the new formula for the abjuration and profession of faith to be emitted by converts to the Church was issued recently by His Excellency, the Most Rev. Giovanni Amleto Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate to the United States. The formula bears the approval of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office.

PROFESSION OF FAITH

"I, N. N., — years of age, born outside the Catholic Church, have held and believed errors contrary to her teaching. Now, enlightened by divine grace, I kneel before you, Reverend Father, N. N., having before my eyes and touching with my hands the Holy Gospels; and with a firm faith I believe and profess each and all the articles that are contained in the Apostles' Creed, that is: I believe in God, etc.

"I admit and embrace most firmly the apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions and all the other constitutions and prescriptions of the Church.

"I admit the Sacred Scriptures according to the sense which has been held and which is still held by Holy Mother Church, whose duty it is to judge the true sense and interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures, and I shall never accept or interpret them except according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

"I profess that the Sacraments of the New Law are truly and pre-

cisely seven in number, instituted for the salvation of mankind, though all are not necessary for each individual: Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony. I profess that all confer grace, and that of these Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Orders cannot be repeated without sacrilege.

"I also accept and admit the ritual of the Catholic Church in the solemn administration of all the above-mentioned Sacraments.

"I accept and hold, in each and every part, all that has been defined and declared by the Sacred Council of Trent concerning Original Sin and Justification. I profess that in the Mass is offered to God a true, real and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; that in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist is really, truly, and substantially the Body and Blood together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there takes place what the Church calls transubstantiation, that is the change of all the substance of bread into the Body and of all the substance of wine into the Blood. I confess that in receiving under either of these species one receives Jesus Christ, whole and entire.

"I firmly hold that Purgatory exists and that the souls detained there can be helped by the prayers of the faithful. Likewise I hold that the saints, who reign with Jesus Christ, should be venerated and invoked, that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be venerated.

"I profess firmly that the images of Jesus Christ and of the Mother of God, ever virgin, as well as of all the saints should be given due honor and veneration. I also affirm that Jesus Christ left to the Church the faculty to grant Indulgences and that their use is most salutary to the Christian people. I recognize the Holy Roman, Catholic and Apostolic Church as the mother and teacher of all the Churches, and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

"Besides I accept, without hesitation, and profess all that has been handed down, defined and declared by the Sacred Canons and by the General Councils, especially by the Sacred Council of Trent and by the Vatican General Council, and in a special manner concerning the primacy and infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. At the same time I condemn and reprove all that the Church has condemned and reprovved. This same Catholic Faith, outside of which nobody can be saved, which I now freely profess and to which I truly adhere, the same I promise and swear to maintain and profess, with the help of God, entire, inviolate and with firm constancy until the last breath of life; and I shall strive, as far as possible, that this same faith shall be held, taught and publicly professed by all those who depend on me and by those of whom I shall have charge.

"So help me God and these Holy Gospels!"

F. E. M.

The Church Builder.—We welcome in our midst a new periodical, *The Church Builder*, published "from time to time in the interest of church building of the better sort, church music, liturgics, paramentics, campanology, and kindred subjects" (certainly a tremendous program) by Rev. F. R. Webber, 316 West 46th St., New York 19, N. Y., at 50 cents a year. Each number has four pages of well-written and well-printed

material on "church building of the better sort," with one or two editorials on present-day church movements and trends. We recommend the periodical to every pastor interested in the subject. So far, two numbers have appeared, one in July, and another in September of this year. To say that Rev. F. R. Webber is well acquainted with the field in which he works and writes, is somewhat of an understatement; what he writes on church building in these two issues shows so much technical knowledge and so much sanctified common sense that the reader finds rich gain in reading the columns. But there is common sense in the editorials, too, of which we here quote a few paragraphs. Rev. Webber writes: "Linked to this strange prayer-hysteria [a result of the present war, which he has described in a preceding editorial] is a fierce monotheism. It is God the Father to whom we must pray, and it is He who saved mankind. Our Savior is never mentioned. Radio prayers and many public prayers end abruptly with no Trinitarian reference whatever. Pamphlets and tracts for servicemen might be mentioned in which is not a single reference to the Savior. Scripture verses pertaining to Jesus Christ are omitted entirely or are altered so as to give them a monotheistic meaning. The man who preaches sin and divine grace is looked upon nowadays by many as a revivalist. Many clergy, at least, want a nice universal religion which stresses the good things of this life and the cultivation of pleasing traits rather than the preaching of the old-time cross." Again: "Everything one picks up nowadays stresses church union. The objective seems to be to get all religions rounded up into one outward organization, with a doctrinal platform so broad and hazy that Jew and Gentile, Roman Catholic, Protestant and everybody else can endorse it. Even a pagan is able to endorse a religion that begins and ends with the preaching of self-improvement in this life. Stress on prayer and a monotheistic supreme being are the foundation stones of many a pagan religion. The Government guarantees to every man, soldier, sailor, or civilian, the right to his full religious beliefs; yet many a clergyman is busy trying to dilute doctrine to such an extent that everybody will be able to accept it." Anything new? No, indeed; but well worth the emphasis which the writer gives to it. In his reference to monotheism Rev. Webber, of course, does not mean to deny that Christianity teaches an absolute monotheism. J. T. M.

Missionaries They.—In *The Sunday School Times* (Oct. 29, 1944) Dr. Ernest Gordon has published a brief notice which shows at what great hazard (if indeed that term is in place) some missionaries are asked and also are willing to leave the homeland to do the Lord's work in a foreign country. We generally equip our missionaries well, pay them living salaries, provide for furloughs, and the like, all of which is as it should be. But sometimes it is well to remember that there are others that go out into the world without all these things and still render the Lord valuable service. The appeal mentioned by Mr. Gordon comes from Mr. F. M. Stead of the orphanage at Kermanshah, Persia, and this is what he writes to secure the help of a missionary couple to help continue his work: "Neither Mrs. Stead nor I am young any more. Some of our helpers are very efficient, but they cannot take the responsibility. Of course, while the war lasts, it is practically impossible for new mis-

sionaries to come out, but when it ends, we hope the way may be open. We started to build a new house last year and are going on with it, hoping there may be a comfortable place for the new missionaries to live. There is no salary. The missionaries share with the children and helpers what the Lord sends. Love of children, and old people, too, patience in well-doing, courage in the face of danger, calmness in disappointment, faith in God through every trial, unquestioning belief in the Bible and the Gospel as the power of God unto salvation—these are required in those who undertake this work." To this is added the note by Mr. Gordon: "Write for information to Mr. Clement Heydenburk, 1043 Curtis Ave., Petoskey, Mich." Today when there is so much discussion about physical and mechanical equipment and organization it may be well for us to give the simple faith and methods of the "lower bracket" mission units a little more than ordinary study.

J. T. M.

McGuffey Taught More Than Reading.—Under this heading, Carl D. Soule in *The Christian Century* (Oct. 18, 1944) calls for a new type of reader for our public schools combining the advantages which the McGuffey readers offered with those of modern scientific studies. The matter is certainly worth studying in view of the great influence which good or bad reading exerts upon youthful minds and the present-day juvenile delinquency. If pastors bear in mind that only too few of Lutheran boys and girls attend Christian day schools and that many of their young parishioners receive their primary education in the public school, they cannot help interesting themselves in the question: "Just what is it that the children of my church are reading in school?" In his analysis of McGuffey's Third Reader the writer finds that "the overwhelming bulk of the material is moral or religious in tone." The results of his study he states as follows: "There are 16 selections which may be classed as secular in character, 51 which are moral, and 12 which are ethical-religious. God is mentioned 26 times, the Bible twice, the commandments four times, heaven five times, the church seven times, and there are included the Lord's Prayer, an evening prayer, and a hymn. McGuffey had no inhibitions about propagandizing the value of honesty, industry, frugality, temperance, kindness, and reverence for God." The writer next calls attention to the deep interest which Henry Ford has shown for the McGuffey Readers, of which he had reprints made for use in his Greenwich Village School. "That was," as the writer judges, "a normal and sincere thing for Mr. Ford to do, for the Reader finds an almost perfect reflection in his life and habits. He is the John Carpenter who as a boy ingeniously made a play horse out of odds and ends and 'now is a master workman with a shop of his own.' He is the 'little Fan' who translates his love for others into gifts and institutions, saying little beforehand or afterward. He is the one who not only 'be-ware of the first drink' but also of the first smoke! He knows the way of the sun, choosing quietness and persistence rather than bluster and anger." "But the insufficiencies of the McGuffey Reader," the writer goes on to say, "are exemplified in Mr. Ford as well as its virtues. Like McGuffey he has not grasped the extent to which many men work hard, save money, exercise honesty, and yet have their economic foundations torn loose by unemployment, bank failures, and ill health. . . . There is

a widespread feeling among Ford workers that although industry and honesty have brought Mr. Ford happiness and success, in their own lives there is an uncertain connection between virtue and worldly prosperity." The writer next compares with the old McGuffey Readers the modern readers for the early grades, which he regards as more colorful than McGuffey. For the modern readers the writer has many good things to say, but his conclusion is: "The final judgment must be this: McGuffey composed a reader which not only taught the child to read but whose content had such strong moral and religious overtones that some spiritual growth inevitably took place. Modern publishers and writers are desirous of a wide circulation for their books; therefore, nothing possibly offensive to Moslem, Jew, or Christian is included. They make the basic reader primarily a vehicle for the pronouncing of words and the remembering of content by means of vocabulary, print, color, and interest. In supplementary readers some McGuffeys are venturing to make content a vehicle for social insights." The closing paragraph of the article is especially noteworthy. We read: "A new type of reader is called for, one whose technical composition is determined by scientific studies but whose content is an integrated combination of McGuffey's teaching concerning personal relations and Centerville's teaching concerning social relations. [Centerville is the title of a supplementary reader, which presents to the child the development of a backward rural town into a modern community where better roads, stores, and schools have their part.] This type is required by juvenile delinquency, by the absence of half of our child population from church schools, by racial conflicts and international strife. Its need is revealed by the insight that science is a false messiah and that a high school graduate without moral worth is nothing to be proud of. The call for it is justified by the valid judgment that character education cannot be imparted without a religious basis and that somehow the fact of God's existence and nature must be a part of the school curriculum. Otherwise we have a cut-flower civilization—ephemeral beauty, no roots. The writers of public school readers have the same choice as the leaders of the church and nation—whether the well-being of the community in the future shall be secured by scientific studies alone or by a combination of science and ethics or by science and *ethics grounded in theology*." The underscoring of the last words has been done by us, because we feel that they suggest the only real solution of the problem. But the combination of science, ethics, and theology is impossible in the public school, which at best can attain only to that of science and ethics. No matter from what angle the problem of successful child training may be approached, the honest student, keeping in mind the values of moral and spiritual training, will always arrive at the solution for which our Church has always stood as a body—the Christian day school, in which sound, helpful reading, based, of course, on a modern approach, is supported and reinforced by the teaching of Christian religion.

J. T. M.

Brief Items.—On Oct. 26 Great Britain was shocked to hear that the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. William Temple, had died that day, having suffered a heart attack. He was 63 years old and had been the "Primate of All England" for two and one-half years. His liberal theological

position is adverted to by Professor Mayer in the article contained in this issue, "Liberal Theology and the Reformed Churches."

Eight British prisoners of war interned in Germany have been ordained as ministers of the Church of England in a ceremony believed unprecedented during the present conflict, according to word received here by the War Prisoners' Aid of the Y. M. C. A. from headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. Theological students before joining the Armed Forces, the ordinands continued their studies in German prison camps. It is believed that the ordinations were performed by an Anglican bishop of a non-belligerent country or by a neutral bishop of a Church recognizing intercommunion with the Church of England.

The Protestant Voice

It is said that Charles H. Spurgeon counted as the highest compliment ever paid him the words of an open enemy, who said, "Here is a man who has not moved an inch forward in all his ministry and at the close of the nineteenth century is teaching the theology of the first century and is proclaiming the doctrine of Nazareth and Jerusalem current 1800 years ago." — *Watchman-Examiner*.

According to the *Christian Century*, Protestant missions are faring badly at the hands of the government in Portuguese possessions in Africa. The Foreign Missions Conference "has found it necessary to make representations to the Department of State (of our own country) concerning the denial of visas to missionaries seeking to return to these African countries. One mission board has not been able to replace personnel in Portuguese Angola for four years in spite of repeated efforts to secure official permission to do so."

Pennsylvania has in this year observed the tercentenary of the birth of William Penn, the Quaker leader who founded the State.

In Mexico, attacks on Protestantism continue to be made by Catholics and, according to a correspondent in the *Christian Century*, this hostile campaign increases its force every day. The press is used for these onslaughts. The Bible in one of the press articles is called "a white elephant." When recently in Mexico City a Protestant meeting was held in a Methodist church, tear gas bombs were thrown under the pews. Rome has not changed.

In German railway carriages that pass the Swedish frontier at Helsingborg, as the *Lutheran* reports on the basis of a Swedish paper's account, leaflets have been found on which this prayer is printed, "O God, forgive me my sins. Forgive me my share of guilt in Hitler's war. O Jesus, I live for Thee. O Jesus, I die for Thee. O Jesus, I am Thine in life and in death."

The stated clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. (Northern Presbyterians) has issued statistics showing that this denomination now numbers 8,628 churches and a membership of 2,098,091. There are 9,472 ministers, of whom 650 are now in war service, 1,297 young men are "enrolled as candidates for the ministry." "Per-capita giving, excluding six presbyteries in foreign missionary lands, rose from \$23.69 last year to \$25.96." Foreign missions (16 countries) received \$2,438,145.00.

A.

Book Review

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo.

You That Labor. By Myron Lindblom. The Wartburg Press, Columbus, Ohio. 77 pages, 5×7¼. 25 cents.

This booklet, which is to be followed by another edition later in the year, as the publishers announce, is an attempt to make the Christian religion palatable to the laboring man of America. An undertaking of this type would seem a trifle incongruous in the midst of the Lutheran Church, which is, on the whole, composed of members in the middle and lower economic brackets and can hardly be said to include many industrialists. However, the intention of the book is undoubtedly good. Its first part contains a story of a workingman who won a friend for Christ. This victory was followed by other successes, which are vividly portrayed. The reader would sometimes have preferred a somewhat less vigorous language and takes exception to the fact that the pulpit is supposed to be made the springboard for social service propaganda. The Church teaches its members to work for amelioration of social conditions everywhere, but does not take a direct part in these efforts, since it is pledged to win souls through the preaching of the Gospel. The last part of the book presents a rather interesting discussion on the question: "Do You Go to Church?" which contains some fine arguments for regular attendance at church.

P. E. KRETZMANN

The Social Gospel of Walther Rauschenbusch and Its Relation to Religious Education. By Vernon Parker Bodein. Yale University Press, 1944. 168 pages, 6×9¼. \$3.00.

This book fully corroborates, as it adequately documents, the evaluation of the "social gospel" offered in an article in this periodical earlier in the year. (Vol. XV:459 ff.) The publisher asserts that this study "reveals with clarity and cogency the middle way between the two extremes of humanism and 'neo-orthodoxy,' meeting both the need for personal salvation and the need for a changed social order." And the Preface clarifies this statement by declaring: "The conception of the Kingdom of God is the center of Rauschenbusch's social gospel. The Kingdom means to him the Reign of God on earth. It is of this world and in this world and is concerned with all of life. (P. vii.) Farther down on the same page the author states: Rauschenbusch "offers a theological formulation of the social gospel which would place the doctrine of the Kingdom of God in the center of theology." These statements of the Preface are borne out by the author's entire presentation. So completely was Rauschenbusch engrossed in the concept of the Kingdom of God "here and now" that he included in his treatise *For the Right*: "for right cooking and dressing and living; for right thinking and speaking"; which definitely makes his attitude presentworldly, as distinguished from Rom. 14:17. The author states that "the social gospel has something to say about the doctrines of the Holy Spirit, Revelation, Inspira-

tion, Prophecy, and about the sacraments of the Lord's Supper and Baptism." (P. 61.) And what is said concerning these doctrines is not in accordance with Scriptural truth. "Rauschenbusch believes that it is a mistake to interpret the Greek phrase ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν in Luke 17:20, 21 as meaning 'within you.' It does not mean an internal and spiritualized Kingdom, he insists. He opposes the spiritual interpretation of the Kingdom because he thinks it tends to mystical experiences which by their nature lead one away from any constructive reformation of society." (P. 75.) Then the author continues: "The Kingdom of God is of this world," a statement which directly contradicts John 18:36. According to Bodein's explanation of the stand taken by Rauschenbusch, the latter denied, or refused to be concerned with, "any metaphysical problem involved in trinitarian and Christological doctrines" (p. 104), that "the orthodox doctrine of original sin is of little concern to Walter Rauschenbusch" (p. 112). He sets aside the doctrines of the fall of man (p. 113), is not concerned with any attempted discrimination between the deity of Christ and His divinity (p. 119), does not want the atonement and justification to be taught as the Bible teaches it. The entire book offers convincing evidence that Rauschenbusch made the fundamental error of confusing the fruits of Christianity (which include good works also in the social field) with the essence of Christianity (which is the acceptance of Christ as the individual's personal Savior). Incidentally a touch of humor is presented in a printer's error, when on page 29 the text has *Judenvereine* instead of *Jugendvereine*. P. E. KRETZMANN

Broken Pillars. By Harold Garnet Black. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. 129 pages, 7¼×5¼. \$1.50.

Anyone who reads this book will profit by so doing. Pastors will find material for their classes and for their sermons. More stress ought to have been given to the fact that the commandments are first of all directed to the heart. The author does not entirely overlook this, for in elaborating on the commandment "Thou shalt not covet," he says: "This is the only one that is concerned with motives; it strikes at the source of all the sins forbidden in the other nine. This last word from Sinai has primarily to do with man's relation with his fellows. It is unlike the earlier ones in that they prohibit only the overt act. This one, however, gets below external actions and reaches down into the hidden places of the mind, into the thought life wherein lie the springs of human conduct." (P. 97.) In His Sermon on the Mount, Jesus tells us that all commandments are transgressed in *thoughts*, words, and deeds. Also the summary of the commandments given by Jesus, Matt. 22:37-39, shows that the commandments are first of all directed to the heart. The author ought to have given more attention to this in the explanation of each commandment.

J. H. C. FRITZ

Revivalism in America, Its Origin, Growth, and Decline. By William Warren Sweet. Charles Scribner's Sons. New York. 192 pages. \$2.00.

Dr. Sweet has given us in this book the results of his studies of the religious phenomenon which we call revivalism. It has long been a highly controversial subject and has often caused divisions in the

American Church. The virtue of this book lies chiefly in this, that the author has gone to great pains in showing the background of our pioneer era, out of which revivalism sprang, and that revivalism was a great effort on the part of church leaders and members to save early Americanism from religious bankruptcy. Those who have been the severest critics of revivalism have usually overlooked the fact that Christianity in America "in the good old days" was at low ebb; that the percentage of our population enrolled in the churches has been steadily increasing from an all-time low at the beginning of the last century; and that the religious revivals played a most important role in "saving many brands from the burning." When our own Wyneken, in his famous "Call for Help," issued a little over a century ago, described the deplorable religious conditions in his part of the country, he was really depicting conditions as they prevailed in vast sections beyond his own territory.

Another charge which is often raised against the old-time revivals, namely, that their results were too superficial, is also refuted by the author. He admits a degree of superficiality, but brings sufficient evidence to prove that many frontier denominations followed up the revivals with painstaking religious instruction. To quote a significant paragraph: "Frontier religion was also much more solidly based than is usually pictured. The long lists of catechisms, Bibles, Testaments, hymnbooks, disciplines, and other religious books which were sold by the Methodist circuit riders to the people on their circuits are evidence of the religious instruction afforded. The fact that almost all the early Presbyterian preachers in the West were also schoolteachers is evidence that theirs was a teaching as well as a preaching ministry."

To give our readers an idea of the scope and arrangement of the volume, here are the main chapter heads: Colonial Revivalism and the Growth of Democracy; Theodore J. Freylinghuysen and the Log College Evangelists; The Colonial Revivalist-Theologians: Jonathan Dickinson and Jonathan Edwards; The Revivalists Who Brought Religion to the Common Man; Revivalism and the Westward March; The By-Products of Revivalism; Revivalism on the Wane.

The book concludes with a selected bibliography and an index. We recommend it to all our pastors for study. W. G. POLACK

My Privilege as Sponsor. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis.

A folder, 4×6½. 5 cents.

This is something new: a folder which is to be given to sponsors at the time when the child is baptized to remind them of their obligations. It is to be feared that not a few who are called upon to act as sponsors think that they have done their duty when they have been witnesses at the child's baptism. J. H. C. FRITZ

Helping Ourselves to Read, Practice Book I. By Wm. Bloom, Elmer Huedepohl. Consultant: Alfred Schmieding. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 62 pages, 11×8½. 45 cents.

On Our Way in Reading, Practice Book II. By Wm. Bloom, Elmer Huedepohl. Consultant: Alfred Schmieding. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 62 pages, 11×8½. 45 cents.

Traveling On in Reading, Practice Book III. By Wm. Bloom, Elmer Huedepohl. Consultant: Alfred Schmieding. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 62 pages, 11×8½. 45 cents.

Reading in the Primary School. By Alfred Schmieding. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 88 pages, 6×6. 45 cents.

The teaching of reading in primary grades is one of the most important and at the same time one of the most difficult subjects for the teacher to master. Wrong reading habits acquired in childhood may seriously hamper the reading ability of the adult throughout life. The four books here presented offer excellent helps to assist the teacher in the development of this important skill. The first three books listed are workbooks and are what the name of the first implies, practice books, in which the pupil is encouraged to help himself in the learning-to-read process without much aid from the teacher. The books are designed for the first three grades and provide tests, word analyses, and other useful activities for the children of these grades. The exercises follow the corresponding units in the respective readers. The directions are simple and aim to develop the skills previously learned. The books in their content and make-up reveal the master hand of the experienced classroom teacher. Pastors who have parochial schools will do well to encourage their teachers to introduce these books if this has not already been done.

Reading in the Primary School is a book for teachers. Its purpose is "to stress the reading trend, above all, the reading trends and practices of the Lutheran school that characterize and distinguish it as an agency of Christian education." The following subjects are treated: 1. Trends in Primary Reading; 2. Preparation for Successful Beginning Reading; 3. Problems and Procedures in the Development of Basic Reading Skills; 4. Readers and Exercise Materials for the Primary School; 5. Reading in Grade I; 6. Reading in Grade II; 7. Reading in Grade III; 8. Results Attained in the Primary School. Teachers will also appreciate the bibliography found on the last two pages. This is an excellent little book. Every beginning teacher should have it at his elbow and live in it. Experienced teachers might well use it to test themselves from time to time whether they are still doing their best for the children entrusted to them in this all-important school subject of reading. The harm done to children by starting them off with a faulty reading habit is beyond calculation. The book may also be placed in the hands of parents whose children are passing through the learning-to-read process and are often called upon to help them with their home work. To achieve the best results, home and school ought to co-operate, but it is important that the same method be employed.

A. M. REHWINKEL

Heaven Below. By E. H. Clayton. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York. 282 pages, 6¼×9¼. \$2.75.

In 1912 Missionary Clayton, D.D., went to China as representative of the American Baptist Mission Society, serving mission schools at Huchow, Chekiang, and at last at Hangchow, where his school became a refuge for thousands of Chinese women and children during and

after the occupation of this once flourishing city. In 1942 he returned to America on the *Gripsholm*, but after the war he intends to return to China to continue his work; for, as he says, nothing can save China but Christianity. The book records manifold gripping experiences of his, especially such as happened during the destructive Sino-Japanese war. But there are delightful episodes, too, such as big-game hunting in the mountains, family experiences of a quite human missionary, whose wife and five children, after all, are nearest and dearest to him, etc. The whole narrative is pervaded by an enriching, refreshing humor, found frequently even in descriptive passages of tragic incidents. The title perhaps was suggested by the proverbial saying: "Above is heaven; below Hangchow." Dr. Clayton is a regular contributor to such magazines as the *Yale Review*, the *American Magazine*, the *Christian Herald*, *Missions*, and others. *Heaven Below* is an engaging, instructive, and timely book, which, we are sure, will do much to revive missionary interest in China, and which, well written, splendidly made up, and lacking in the common profanity which disgraces so many otherwise good modern books, will furnish hours of pleasant and profitable entertainment to young and old Christian readers. A good, clean book for Christian homes and schools.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

The Chapel Hymnal. Authorized by the Intersynodical Committee on Hymnology and Liturgics for the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 127 pages. Stiff paper cover. 25 cents.

This little *Chapel Hymnal* contains 103 hymns, all but eight of which have been taken from the *Lutheran Hymnal*. The others are from the *Sunday-School Hymnal*. Each hymn has its musical setting. In addition to the necessary indexes the Orders of Matins and Vespers are included, and prayers for the opening and the close of service, Psalm 23, the Apostles' Creed, the General Confession, the General Prayer, and the Lord's Prayer.

The purpose of this *Chapel Hymnal* is given by the Committee in these words:

"There are many places and occasions outside the church and its stated services when a smaller collection of hymns is more convenient and practical than that of the official *Hymnal*. There are open-air mission festivals, noonday Lenten services in public buildings, Easter sunrise services in the open, meetings of men's clubs, ladies' aid societies, young people's meetings, summer and winter camp conferences, evangelistic services of various kinds, services in hospitals, infirmaries, penal institutions, services in military camps, naval stations, on shipboard, etc. It is for such uses that this little collection has been prepared. Then there are services in new industrial centers, in preaching stations in city, town, and country. To many a person in a hospital or some other institution, to a missionary prospect, individual or family, to many a poor home, this little book would be an appreciated gift.

"This little *Chapel Hymnal* is inexpensive. It is handy and can be carried in the pocket or purse, in the serviceman's duffel and in the servicewoman's handbag.

"May it be a welcome messenger to many hearts, and may it lead them to devout singing of the great songs of Zion!"

May this little *Hymnal* serve this purpose to the greater glory of our God!

W. G. POLACK

The Altar Guild. By David A. Menges. The Muhlenberg Press. Philadelphia. 47 pages. Stiff paper covers. 40 cents.

This little booklet is intended to give directions to the ladies of the altar guild on the proper care of the altar and the sanctuary. It covers especially the following points: Vesting the Altar; the Altar Cloths; Laundering the Linens; the Use and Arrangement of Flowers; the Arrangements and Care of the Vessels for Holy Communion; the Care of the Brasses and Candles; etc.

The instructions given for the ladies are sober and sensible, with due emphasis on the matter of personal consecration on the part of those who wish to serve the church as members of altar guilds.

W. G. POLACK

BOOKS RECEIVED

Every Teacher a Trained Teacher. Prepared by the Board of Christian Education, Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. Author: A. C. Mueller. 7 pages.

Opening a Parochial School. How to Go About It. Prepared under the Auspices of the Board of Christian Education, Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. Author: A. C. Stellhorn. 12 pages.

Weekday Schools of Religion on Released Time. Prepared by the Board of Christian Education, Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. Author: Clarence Peters. 7 pages.

Soul Secrets. Daily Devotions, November 1, 1944, to December 21, 1944. No. 57. By the Rev. C. W. Berner. 64 pages. Price: 5 cents per copy, postpaid; 48 cents per dozen, postage extra; \$3.00 per hundred, postage extra.

Das verheissene Paradies. Taegliche Andachten fuer die Zeit vom 1. November bis zum 21. Dezember 1944. The Rev. R. Herrmann. Price same as above.

These items are published by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri.

Corrigendum

November number, page 770, line 3, top, should read: placed under suspicion in a critical way, nor are the 430 years, accord-.

To Our Subscribers

It has been our custom to retain the names of our subscribers on our lists for two numbers after the subscription has expired, so that the subscriptions could be continued without interruption in case a renewal came in late. We were very happy to follow this plan at extra expense, but we are now unable to continue this policy because of present conditions.

June, 1943

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE

